THE Anti-Quaker:

OR,

A Compendious *Answer* to a tedious Pamphlet, Entituled,

A Treatise of Oaths,

Subscribed

By a Jury of 12 *Quakers*, whose names are prefixed to it, together with the *Fore-man* of that Jury, the *Ring-leader* of that Tribe, and Head of that Faction, *William Penn*,

Alledging several Reasons why they (no cases excepted) refuse to swear, which are refuted, and the Vanity of them Demonstrated both by Scripture, Reason, and Authority of Ancient, and Modern Writers.

By Misorcus,

A Professed *Adversary* of Vain *Swearing* in common discourse, and communication.

Fear God and keep his Commandments, For this is the whole duty of man, Eccles. 12. 13.

Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God: him shalt thou serve, and cleave unto him, and swear by his Name, Deut. 10. 20.

LONDON,

Printed for *R. Royston*, Bookseller to his most Sacred Majesty, at the Angel in *Amen-Corner*, 1676.

C 8322,676.5*

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
FROM THE
ANDREW PRESTON PEABODY
FUND
June 6, 1936

TO The most Judicious

View of the Right Honourable the *Lords* and *Commons* Assembled in the High Court of Parliament.

THE unworthy Author most Humbly presents the ensuing *Treatise*, as the 13 Head-Quakers did of late most boldly dedicate their's, *Subscrib'd* by them *on the behalf of the rest of their Friends* (they are their own words) with an earnest supplicate to be freed from the imposition of all Oaths; which *for pure conscience*

ſake (as they ſay) *they cannot take at all*, concealing (what is their main drift) their deſire to obtain a free uſe for the future of their private Meetings, or *Conventicles*, the *Seed-plots* of faction, and ſeditious practiſes, as St. *Auguſtine* proves at large in divers Epiſtles to the then Raigning Emperours, againſt the *Donatiſts* (the *Quakers* Progenitors) commending to them by way of advice this moderate *State-maxime*, *Doctrina præcedat, Diſciplina ſequatur.*

With reſpect to the former part of it I have (as many of my *Brethren* in the Miniſtry have learnedly done before me) imployed my weak endeavours for the ſatisfaction of their ſcrupulous Conſciences, referring the execution of the latter

part

part of it, for severe *Discipline*, to your *Honours* great Authority, and most Sage Counsels; for a blessing on which, *to the advancement of Gods glory, the good of the Church, the safety, honour and welfare of our Soveraign and his Kingdoms*, with the publick you have the daily private Prayers and Supplications of him who conceales his *Name*, not out of a guilty Fear, but a cautious Prudence, not willing to have it aspers'd with reproaches and unjust calumnies, with bitter railings and Invectives, against which there is no fence from the most unspotted Innocence, and wherewith they usually bespatter those who dissent from them in their vain, false, and Antiscriptural opinions, which they cannot maintain either by Gods holy Word,

*Corrigi eos cupimus non necari, nec Disciplinam circa eos negligi. Aug. Ep. 127.

or

or any rational Arguments, as I shall (God assisting me) Prove, and Illustrate in the following Treatise, presented in all Humility to your *Honours* for its Patronage, not doubting of your gracious pardon for the boldness of my Dedication.

THE REFUTER'S Preface.

THERE *is a Generation* (ſayes *Solomon*, Prov. 30. 12.) *that are pure in their own eyes, and yet are not waſhed from their filthineſs*; a ſort of men that *walk after the Fleſh in the luſt of Uncleanneſs, and deſpiſe Government, preſumptuous, ſelf-willed, and that are not afraid to ſpeak evil of Dignities*, (or thoſe that are ſet over them by God to be their Rulers and Governours) 2 *Pet.* 2. 10. yet, being ſwell'd with a Tympany of Pride, are admirers of themſelves, even to the contempt of others. I heartily wiſh, for their Souls ſake, that this Character of St. *Peter* and *Solomon* might not juſtly be appropriated to ſome of the *People called*

led Quakers, who refuse to Swear, and will not be tied to the discharge of their Duties by Oaths ministred unto them by Subordinate Magistrates, whereby they deserve to be more properly called (as they are indeed) *Anabaptists*; *Quo genere hominum nullum aut pertinacius aut arrogantius, aut in erroribus aut figmentis feracius*, so the judicious *Cramerus* in his third Classis of Hereticks, *cap.* 4. *Than whom no kind of men are more pertinacious and arrogant, and more pregnant in the propagating of false and erroneous Opinions*; of which (amongst divers others) this is one, *That it is not lawfull to Swear in any case whatsoever:* and this opinion they ground upon our Saviours Precept or Injunction, *Matth.* 5. 34. The proper sense and meaning of which Precept when I have fully demonstrated, both from the *occasion* of his delivering it, and from the *scope* or *intention* of it; confirming my Interpretation by the joynt consent of the best Interpreters, also by the strength of divers weighty Reasons; it will appear to all judicious Readers, that the foresaid Tenet is both absurd, false, and frivolous; and that all their numerous Allegations or Testimonies to the contrary (which are no fewer than 207.) out of the Writings of *Gentiles*, *Jews*, and *Christians*, are to little or no purpose, of no validity to maintain the *Quaker's Thesis* or *Position*, in regard that most of them only inveigh against Perjury and ordinary or common Swearing in our familiar Discourses, which was chiefly intended (as it shall be evidently proved) by our Saviours Prohibition, *Swear not at all.* Upon the *rind* or *shell* (*i. e.* the Letter) of which words the forenamed feed so much, and gnaw the *Bone*, that they never

never come at the *Kernel* and *Marrow*, or true *meaning* of them.

Before I proceed to the explication of this *prohibitive* Precept, I must take leave to commend to the view of the people that go under the name of *Quakers*, (or rather to the Pen-men of that *Treatise*) a Saying of a Christian Divine Philosopher; *There was never any Truth, though ratified by the Authoritie of God's Word, which had not a Lye for its Attendant*; which must not be so understood, as if *Truth* were the natural Parent of a *Lye*; but in regard of the malice and perverseness of men who did darken it with their misty Glosses, and corrupt it by their wresting of it, with false Interpretations. Thus the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, like many in our Dayes, had learned this Art of spreading and maintaining their false Doctrine, by corrupting the Sacred Text. For, whereas God, commanding us to have in due and awful Reverence his holy Name, forbade the *Jews*, and in them us Christians, to *take the same in vain*, Exod. 20. 7. *i.e.* to take it into our mouths idly, or to no purpose, without any warrant from Necessity, and without respect to the advance of his Glory; the *Scribes* or Doctors of the Law expounding לשוא *in vain*, by לשקר *falsly*, i. e. to back and confirm a Lye, which word we find, *Levit.* 19. 12. *Thou shalt not Swear by my name falsly*; they hereby confounded two distinct Precepts. For, by the later in *Leviticus* is forbidden Perjury, which is the confirmation of a Lye by an Oath: by the former Precept in *Exodus* all vain, inconsiderate and rash Oaths, which men commonly use to confirm or ratifie the Truth in their

Πάντι λόγῳ καὶ δόγματι ἀληθείας παραφύεται τὸ ψεῦδος.
Athenag. l. de Resurrectione.

private Negotiations, Contracts, Bargainings, and Discourse.

From this false Gloss of the *Scribes* interpreting the Third Commandment, as if only *Perjury* were forbid by it, and this too only in the abuse of God's Sacred *Name*; from this corrupt Spring issued these three perverse and depraved Doctrines, which in our Saviour's time were setled in the minds and hearts of the deluded Jews.

First, to Swear by the *Creature*, and to forswear, they affirmed to be no sin.

Secondly, they counted it no breach of the Third Commmandment, if they used in their ordinary discourse the *Name* of God, so long as they did what they promised, and affirmed what was true. With the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* in this Second Opinion agree both *Maldonat* on *Levit.* 19. and *Socinus* with his followers.

Thirdly, from this later impure Stream or Opinion issued another, as corrupt and unsound; it was this, That whatsoever they had bound themselves to by an Oath in the Name of God, they were obliged to do it, were the thing never so unjust and bad.

Our blessed Saviour, as it did become so wise a Teacher *who came from God*, as *Nicodemus* witnessed of him, *Joh.* 3. 2. intending and endeavouring to root out of the peoples minds these *Pharisaical* Doctrines, or Principles unsound in themselves, and destructive of an holy Life or good Manners, in his First Sermon *Ad populum* on the Mount, gave them all, as it were, their deaths Wound, stifled and choak'd them with one general Precept or Prohibition, strengthened with Divine Authority, the Authority

thority of his own Person, *But I say unto you, Swear not at all*; i. e. *Swear not at all per ullam rem creatam*, by any thing created, or which is the Workmanship of God, for by so doing you will attract to your selves the guilt of Idolatrie, by ascribing to the Creature that which is proper and essential to the Creatour, i. e. *omnisciency*, and *omnipotency*, as if it knew our hearts and secret intentions, and could punish us if we should be guilty of Perjury. With the forenamed *Beza* in the Margine concurrs his Compatriot, and no less Learned *Calvin* in his Comment on the Text, whose assertion is this, *Particula* omnino *non ad* jurandi *Verbum refertur, sed ad subjectas Sacramentorum formulas*, i. e. *The Particle* At all *is to be referred not to the words which go before* Swear not, *but to that which follows, Neither by* Heaven— *nor by the* Earth— *neither by* Hierusalem— *nor by thy* Head— By this our Saviour gave a check to the Scribes first Doctrine, *viz.* That to Swear by the Creature was no sin.

Beza in Loc. Ex proximis sequentibus quas Christus damnat formulis liquet, non ipsum jusjurandum reprehendi.

Secondly, as this Prohibition, *Swear not at all*, excludes the *Creatures*, be they the holy *Evangelists*, *Saints* departed, or *Angels*, (whom to invocate, as in Prayer, so in Swearing, is held to be lawful by the *Romanists*, as it was by the *Manichees*:) so it includes and forbids all vain and superfluous Oaths in use then among the Jews, and now too frequently used by Christians in their common and familiar Discourses. That this was likewise our blessed Saviours meaning, may be evidenced by that which follows by way of Precept after the Prohibition, *But let your communication be Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay*, i. e. In your common talk and discourse use only a bare *Affirmation* of what you know to be true, and a simple *Negation* of what you

Epiphan. l. 1. c. 19.

Vers. 37.

you are assured is false, without interposing the dreadful and Sacred Name of God. *Let your communication be Yea, Yea,* &c. On which words *Ugo* thus Glosses, *Let not thy actions give thy words the Lye: what thou hast affirmed or promised with thy tongue, ratifie the same by thy action: and what thou hast denied in thy words, confirm not the same by thy deeds.* This Glos is ingenious, and might be embraced, if Christ had said only, *Let your Yea be Yea,* &c. but these words, *Let your communication*— being prefixed to the *Yea, Yea,* imply and require another (and that more proper) interpretation, which may be this, Because men usually swear, that, what they affirm or deny, may be fully credited or believed; our blessed Lord therefore commands us rather to use a double Affirmation, saying, *Yea, Yea*; and a double Negation, *Nay, Nay,* than rashly swear by Gods holy *Name*: By which to swear (and that in their familiar discourses) the Jews in our Saviours time thought it (as was said before) lawful, (and so they had been taught by the Scribes) in case the thing was true which they had sworn. And forasmuch as they deemed it not to be Perjury (or thought they were not perjured) if they had Sworn only by the Creatures and broke their Oath, misinterpreting that Text, *Exod.* 20. 7. *Thou shalt not forswear thy self, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine Oaths:* Our Saviour for these reasons (and this was the scope only, or intent of his Prohibition) said unto them, *Swear not at all*; Swear not by the *Creature* (to do this is *superstitious* and *idolatrous.*) Swear not *rashly* nor *lightly*; this is *prophane* and *blasphemous.* Swear not *falsly*; this is to back a Lye with an Oath, upon which follows the guilt of Perjury. Lastly, Swear not *unjustly*, bind not

Quod dicis verbo dic operè, quod negas verbo noli confirmare facto. Ugo.

Beza.

not your self by an Oath to do what is against the rule of Justice or Honesty; by this you make an Oath to be *Iniquitatis vinculum*, a bond of Iniquity, which is rather to be broken with repentance and sorrow of heart for taking of it, than kept. Such was *Herod's* rash Oath to the wanton Daughter of *Herodias*, to give unto her whatsoever she should ask: Such was that of the *Jews*, who bound themselves under a Curse, saying, *That they would neither eat nor drink, till they had killed Paul.* Mark 6. 23. Act. 23. 14.

The *Prohibition* of Christ being thus explained, (for which I have the consent of the most and best Interpreters, both modern and ancient, whose names are so numerous, that the Margine cannot contain them) to that Explication I shall subjoyn many undeniable and weighty Reasons, to evince and prove the falsity and absurdity of the *Anabaptist's Tenet*, or *Thesis* (which is grounded upon that general *Prohibition*) *That in any case whatsoever it is not lawful for a Christian to swear.* For the disproving, and refuting of which dangerous Position (and that I may reconcile *Moses* to *Christ*, the *Law* to the *Gospel*, many Texts in *Deuteronomy*, and in the *Prophets*, which enjoyn us to *Swear* by the Name of God, to the prohibitive command of our Saviour) let me premise this for an undeniable Maxime or Thesis, *That the Precepts of the Gospel are not repugnant, or contrary to the Commands of the Law.* This Position is defended and proved at large by S. *Augustine* in his Nineteenth Book against *Faustus* the Heretick, *Cap.* 16. What the Law commands, the Gospel does not forbid; and what the one forbids, the other does not allow: but both meet together in a sweet consent and harmony of Truth, and

Deut. 6. 13. 10. 20. Isa. 65. 16. Jerem. 12. 16.

Præcepta Evangelii non contrariantur præceptis legis. *Aug.*

and (as it were) kiss and embrace each other; so that the Gospel in a manner bespeaks the Law in the words of that *Parasitical* Servant in the *Comedie* to his Master, *Quod ais tu, quod negas nego*, what you command I commend, what you condemn I disallow: and there is no surer or better way of expounding the Law than by the Gospel, and of the Gospel than by the Law, according to that known saying of *Irenæus*, l. 4. c. 63. *Secundùm Scripturas expositio legitima est, & sine periculo, It is the safest course and method for the ending of Disputes, to expound Scripture by Scripture, one Text by another, if there be a seeming difference in the former from the later.*

Now I must put this Question to a dissenting *Quaker*, to any one of the People so called, Dost thou imagine, or darest thou say, that *Moses* and the Prophets borrowed not their Light of Revelation or Doctrine from Christ the everlasting *Sun* of *Righteousness* (who likewise being the Eternal *Word* of God, spake to them by his Spirit, and dictated to them what we find in their Writings, as Rules of our Faith and Manners?) I presume thou wilt not say it; and unless thou wilt assert, that they were not true *Stars*, but only slimie *Meteors* coloured with shews and pretences of Truth, and that their Doctrine is false; unless thou assert this (which is an horrid and hainous crime, even blasphemy, but to think) and I know thou wilt not, then thou must set thy Seal to this undeniable Truth, that in some cases it is not unlawful or sinful to use an *Oath*, according to that of the Prophet *Jeremiah* in his Exhortation to revolted *Israel*, *Thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth, in Truth, in Judgement, and in Righteousness.* i. e. When thou makest

Mal. 4. 2.

Jerem. 4. 2.

or

or takest an Oath, thou shalt swear by the Eternal Lord of Life, who is a discerner of the mind and heart, to whom are clearly known the inward motions of it, who will likewise severely punish us if we be false in our sayings, and unjust in our doings. This profession we make when we invocate him in taking of an Oath, being called to it by the *Magistrate*, and hereby God's name is sanctified, (it being an extraordinary part of God's worship) but with this *proviso*, That the three forenamed Cautions or Circumstances mentioned before by the *Prophet* do attend it. They that thus Swear by Gods Name *shall be commended*, Psal. 63. 12. *i.e.* They that swear in weighty matters (when they are urged to it) either for the confirmation of the Truth, or to maintain their suspected Innocency, and oblige themselves by an Oath before a Magistrate to do that which is righteous, just, honest, and good; such men sin not, neither offend against our *Saviour's*, or S. *James* his Prohibition, *Swear not*, chap. 5. 12. by which is condemned and forbid only rash and inconsiderate, false and dishonest *Swearing*, approved not of by the Laws of men, and condemned by the Word of God, by which the contrary is commended, *Isa.* 65. 16. *He that Sweareth in the earth shall Swear by the God of Truth.*

Iudicio caret juramentum incautum, veritate juramentum mendax, Iustitia juramentum iniquum & illicitum. Aquin.

To my former Position and Question proposed to a Scrupulous *Quaker* (or rather *Anabaptist*) I shall add another *Quære*, which I desire him to consider; it is this, Whether Christ's Assertion and Testimony of Himself be not true, *Matth.* 5. 17. *I came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it.* I cannot expect, if I should talk with him, but that he would say in his proper Language, *Yea.* This being granted (as he dares not

deny it) then I would reply, and tell him, That if Christ came *not to destroy the Law*, then he forbade not what the Law commands; and if he came to *fulfil it*, then he must acknowledge that Christ did that for which he came into the World (for his coming was not in vain, or fruitless) and that He (*in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead*, i. e. who is perfect God and man in one person, and in whom there is a fulness of Wisdom and all heavenly Grace) *fulfilled* the Law two manner of ways, *opere & ore*, by his *Works* and *Words*, or Divine Doctrine.

Gal. 2. 9

Aquin. 12. 101. Q. 2. Art.

First, by his Works or Deeds, in that, to leave us an Example of a meek heart and sound obedience, he submitted himself to the *Ceremonial* Law, being circumcis'd the Eighth day, &c. So likewise to satisfie the rigour of God's Justice, he fully performed the *Moral* by his *Active* obedience, doing what the Lord required of us to be done, thereby to bring us to Heaven; and by his *Passive*, suffering for our Sins to redeem us from the pains and torments of Hell.

Verum legis sensum exprimendo.

Præcepta legis ordinando ut rutius observaretur quod lex vetuerat. Aquin.

Secondly, he fulfilled the Law by his heavenly *Doctrine*, this he did by explaining the full scope, the intent or meaning of the Law (as in those two Cases of *Murder* and *Adultery*, Matth. 5. 21, 27.) and by prescribing Rules for the better observing of the Laws *Affirmative* and *Negative* commands.

This because the Law forbids all kinds of *Perjury*, *Thou shalt not Swear by my Name falsly*, Lev. 6. 3. that this *Prohibition* might be the better kept and observed, and men secured from the danger of so great a sin (in regard that men accustomed to Swearing, account *Perjury* but a light and frivolous thing) Christ therefore in his Sermon upon the Mount, gave to his

Auditors

Auditors or Disciples a safe and wholsom admonition, *Swear not at all*, i.e. never, *nisi in causâ necessitatis* (as the Learned *Zanchy* upon that Text) except in cases of Necessity, *Ubi gloria Domini vindicanda est, aut fratris ædificatio promovenda*, when and where the glory of God is to be vindicated by a bold defence of the Truth opposed, and when our neighbours welfare may thereby be promoted, and either our own credit or reputation preserved. St. *Chrysostome* himself (who was a rigid enemy to *Swearing* (i.e. to vain and idle *Oaths* in mutual and private Conference) and in whose mistaken and wrested Sayings the Pen-man of the *Treatise against Oaths* does much * triumph) he in his Fifth Homily *Ad pop. Antioch.* does clearly admit of, or allow an Oath to be taken in a case of Necessity, as is evident by these words, (cited in English, *p.* 72. of the Treatise) "*Moreover, this* "*I say, That in the mean time we may cut off* "*Superfluous Oaths, those I mean, which are made rashly amongst Friends and Servants without any Necessity*, &c. Hence I infer (having great and weighty Reasons which hereafter I shall produce, and that florid golden mouth Father's warrant for my Assertion,) That as *Necessity* (as we say commonly) has no Law; so to take an *Oath* when a man is necessitated or compelled to take it, is not superfluous, vain, or sinful, and no violation of *Christ's* Precept, or of *Moses* his Law, I mean the Third Commandment, *Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain*: For if every *Negative* Precept does include (which no man will deny) the contrary to it, which is the *Affirmative*, we may then inferre, and say with *Moses* (who spake from God) *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy* Deut. 6. 13.

* The Author has stuff'd two and twenty Pages in his Treatise with Citations out of that most Eloquent Father, which are nothing to his purpose; for S. Chrysostome condemns not all kinde of Swearing.

Necessitas tollit ferias. Prov. Heb.

God, and serve him, and shalt Swear by his Name, not vainly, or to no purpose, but to justifie the Truth, or to give to thy Neighbour (who requires it) an assurance of thy integrity, or sincerity of thy promise; and in other cases which are warranted by an inevitable *Necessity*. Thus if any one should accuse thee of perfidiousness or slander, as having with the black tooth of Calumny wounded his reputation, or defrauded him of his goods; If thou, to purge thy self from this foul aspersion, shalt deny the fact by a simple and bare protestation of thy innocency, and he still suspecting thee to the contrary, shall require an *Oath* of thee, to confirm his belief of what thou denyest; in such a case, to vindicate thy credit, and to work out of his mind that injurious suspicion, thou mayest use a solemn *Attestation*, by invocating or calling God to witness the Truth of thy Assertion. And that in such or the like case (to settle in another a perswasion of our Integrity) an *Oath* between private persons is no sin; we have the examples of God's Saints in the holy Scriptures to warrant it, as that of *Abraham*, who being urged to it by *Abimelech* King of *Gerar*, did Swear unto him that he would not deal falsly with him, *&c.* The like *promissory* Oath passed between *Jacob* and *Laban*, *Gen.* 31. 53. and from *Boaz* to *Ruth*, Chap. 3. 13. Let me annex to these Examples the testimony of Saint *Augustine*: When Christ (sayes he) enjoyned us to use in our common discourse, by way of Affirmation and Negation, *Yea, Yea, Nay, Nay*, He said not that whatsoever is more than this is evil or sin, but *proceeds from evil*, i.e. *from some bad principle, from the evil of infirmity* in him, who requires an Oath, and that is his *incredulity*, suspecting the Truth of the others Narration

Gen. 21. 23, 24.

Aug. l. 10. de Serm Dom c. 30.

tion or Report, or his want of *Charity*, entertaining in his breaſt a bad opinion of his Brother, and perhaps undeſervedly; *Tu enim non malè facis qui benè uteris juratione*, &c. *For thou doeſt not ill who uſeſt an Oath well* (i. e. to a good end) *that thou mayeſt beget in another a firm belief of the Truth, and of thy ſincerity: He rather doeth ill whoſe diffidence or diſtruſt enforces thee to uſe an Oath; his ſin ſhall not be imputed to thee.*

For the farther ratification of my former *Poſition* concerning an *Oath's* legality, in caſe of an undeniable and inevitable *Neceſſity*, I ſhall propound one *Quære* more to *W. P.* the Quakers Oracle or Anteſignanus of the *Anabaptiſts*, it is this; Suppoſe a knot of Thieves ſhould aſſault thee in thy journey, and, having by force and violence robbed thee of thy money, ſhould urge thee to Swear that thou wilt not betray nor proſecute them by raiſing the Country to a purſuit of them, in the mean time affrighting thee with execrable dreadful Oaths, that unleſs thou ſecure them by a ſolemn *Oath*, they will kill thee; tell me, *W. P.* wouldſt thou in this caſe rather loſe thy life than *Swear*, to which by blaſphemous threats they urge thee? I verily believe, that, as thou haſt a plentiful Eſtate, thou wouldſt not eaſily part with it, and thy life at once, by fondly bogling at an innocent Oath: This perſwaſion I have of thee, becauſe, as thou profeſſeſt thy ſelf, with the reſt of thy Gang, to be *men of Truth*, and tranſcendent Sanctity, ſo I conceive that thou haſt not wholly forfeited thy Reaſon, but by that ſparkling Light which ſtill remains in it, thou (being caſt into theſe ſtreights) wil'ſt conſider, *Firſt*, that if thou refuſeſt to *Swear*, thou ſhalt run upon the rock of a dangerous guilt, which is the breach of the Sixth Commandment

mandment, by which the use of all lawful means for the preservation of our lives is commanded; and if we may preserve them and will not by such means, we are self-murderers. Now *Swearing* is not absolutely forbid neither by Christ nor his Apostles. *Secondly*, Thou surely wouldst consider, that by thy refusing to Swear, thou shouldst be the occasion, or rather the partial cause of the loss of thy Brother's Soul (a Thief by the bond of Nature is thy Brother) he being made guilty of Murther by shedding thy blood, which might be kept in thy veins by thy taking of that harmless *Oath*, the which being once taken, must be religiously kept, for that he that is robbed is bound to be silent, and not to betray a Thief, having Sworn not to do it; so the late most Pious and Learned Bishop of *Norwich* determines the Case, and annexes this saying to his determination, (to deterre all men from *Perjury*, or breaking their Oaths) *When once we have interessed God in any business, it is dangerous not to be punctual in the performance.* With him concurres in the same opinion the profound Doctor *Sanderson* in his Fifth Lecture and Seventeenth Section, where he disputes the case against *Baldwin*, once Professor of Divinity at *Wittenberg*, and having answered his three Arguments alledged to the contrary, concludes, That as it is not unlawful for one to Swear to a Thief (supposing that if he did not, he should certainly be murder'd) so there lies a necessity upon him of keeping that *Oath* not to discover him to the Magistrate, *Si licuit jurare, licebit & juramentum observare*, they are his very words, *pag.* 132. So are not those cited out of his 141. *page* by the falsifying Penner of the *Treatise*: I must therefore be bold to tell that conceited

Cas. Consc. Resol. Dec. 1. c. 8.

Lib. de juram. obligat.

celted man of Truth that he is guilty of *Forgery*, I might rather say in plainer and more expres terms, of a *Lye*; to which the Thirteen Abettors of the Treatise have subscribed, as they have to many more comprehended in that Treatise, (as shall hereafter be evidenced.) The Author (or rather Authors of it, for no doubt many hands and Jesuited cunning Heads concurr'd to the composing of it) having asserted *every Oath to be vain and unlawful*, (under which notion the Oath of *Supremacy* and *Allegiance* must needs fall in his opinion) gives this reason of his Assertion, *For Christ's Prohibition*, Swear not at all, *was not a meer Repetition of what was forbidden under the Law, but what the Law allowed*, "as Bishop Sanderson *well observeth, in these* "*words, It was not needful that Christ should forbid* "*what was forbidden in it self, or was alwayes unlawful,* "*which vain Swearing was and is by the Third Commaund-* "*ment*, Thou shalt not take, &c. *Therefore Christ ex-* "*cluded the Prohibition of the Law*, i. e. *condemned all* "*kinds of Swearing*. This fallacious way of arguing, by making Authors speak what they never said nor intended, and by drawing conclusions from premises misinterpreted, has a great smack and tang of the *Jesuite*. But to the whole I answer thus *partim*, in particular; first I deny the truth of the Assertion, *Every Oath, &c.* and the Reason he gives for it I affirm to be invalid and false, *For Christ's Prohibition, &c.* In opposition to the Reason, First, I shall lay down this *Thesis* or Position, That Christ by his Precept or prohibitive Command repeated (and that he usually did) what was forbid by the Law, such is *vain Swearing*, and *Swearing* by any thing but by the Name of God in weighty causes, and in cases of *Necessity* when we

Pag. 20.

There is not one Syllable to this purpose in that Page 141. of the Book Printed 1647.

we are commanded by the Authority of the Magistrate. Secondly, I affirm that it was needful and very expedient Christ should do it (as it was for Saint *Paul to write the same things to the Philippians*, chap. 3. 1.) and that, *First*, by reason of the perverseness, dulness, stupidity, and forgetfulness of mans nature, which needs *Line upon Line*, *Precept upon Precept*, that is, to have the same Commands and Prohibitions oft repeated, and inculcated. *Secondly*, it was needful and very convenient, that thereby he might shew that there was an amicable harmony or agreement between the *Gospel* and the *Law*, so that what was enjoyned and commanded by the former, is not forbid and condemned by the later. *Thirdly*, it was needful that so he might gain an higher estimate to the *Law of Moses*, by not contradicting or gainsaying of its Precepts, but ratifying the same by his Commands, he being greater than *Moses*, who received those lively Oracles from his mouth on the Mount. And, *Fourthly*, he might do it (*i.e.* repeat the same Commands which were delivered by *Moses*) to refute and give a check to those blasphemous conceits (which he foresaw would spring up in the Church in after Ages) or to those gross opinions of the *Manichees* and of their followers, who maintained that there were two Deities, the one Author of the *Old Law*, the other of the *New*, which are at large confuted by the *Malleus Hæreticorum*, Saint *Austin* in his Tractates against *Faustus* the Manichean, and his Abettors, *Adimantus*, *Fortunatus*, *Secundinus*, and others.

Isa. 28. 13.

Tom 6.

From all that has been said, and for these four Reasons I inferre, that the forenamed Author is guilty of no less a sin than *Blasphemy* by asserting, *That Christ forbade*

Pag. 20.

forbade what the Law allowed, and in the room of ſuch Oaths and Vows as were to be performed unto the Lord, he introduced Yea *and* Nay *with a moſt abſolute* Swear not at all. What is this but to make our Bleſſed Saviour (who ſpake by the Prophets) to contradict himſelf, by commanding one thing in the Law, and another thing in the Goſpel, or by forbidding what he had commanded; as if he (who is unchangeable, and whoſe *Precepts* as well as his *Promiſes* are *Yea and Amen*, i. e. immutable) had upon better thoughts altered his mind or judgement? To think this, much more to ſay it, is blaſphemous. The Author of the *Treatiſe* does in effect ſay as much, by affirming that all Oaths, in their full compaſs and latitude, are by Chriſt's *Swear not at all* prohibited: witneſs his bold Proteſtation, which he makes in his own, and in the name of all his Brethren, *We profeſs our ſelves in the Fear of Almighty God, to be ſuch, as have thus learned Jeſus Chriſt, and for the Reverence we bear to his righteous Commandment, we can't take an Oath in any Caſe.* He ſhould have ſaid, we will not take God's Name in vain; for this in part is the ſenſe and meaning of Chriſt's command, *Swear not at all.*

1 Cor. 1. 20.

Pag. 155.

If the *Treatiſt* (with his Confederates) bears ſuch a Reverence to God's Commandments, why then does he (or how dares he) ſo audaciouſly and openly tranſgreſs againſt Three of them at once? I mean the Fifth, Sixth, and the Ninth, *Honour thy Father, &c. Thou ſhalt do no Murder. Thou ſhalt not bear falſe witneſs againſt thy Neighbour.* This he has done by wounding the reputation of a moſt righteous and Learned Prelate the late Lord Biſhop of *Lincolne*, a renown'd Father of the Church, now a glorious Saint in Heaven;

and by belying him, and that by attesting he wrote that which he never did (for that I cannot find any such thing or words in his most elaborate Work *De juramenti Obligatione*) and is diametrically opposite, or contrary to his known opinion, and the whole frame of his Book. The words which the Father of Lyes put into the *Treatist*'s mouth, and from thence dropt into his erring Pen, are these, *Christ exceeded the Prohibition of the Law*, i. e. condemned all kind of Swearing. Can any believe that so wise, so godly, and acute person did ever say or write this, and thereby contradict himself; who, for the preventing of *Perjury*, has prescribed in that golden Book many excellent Rules for the right taking of an *Oath*, whether it be *Assertory* or *Promissory*, and defines an Oath thus, *Est actus religiosus in quo ad confirmandam rem dubiam Deus testis invocatur*, *A religious act in which* (or by which) *for the confirmation of a thing in doubt* (or called into question, it being uncertain) *God is invocated* (or called upon) *to be a witness*. Pag. 4.

That it is a religious Act he proves, *First*, by the Authority of the Scriptures, * *Deuter. 6. 13. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and Swear by his Name*. *Secondly*, from the joynt consent of all *Nations*, who although they were only led by the dim light of Nature, did account of an *Oath* as a most Sacred thing, and so in their Writings is oft termed a *Sacrament*. He proves it, *Thirdly*, from most evident and clear Reason, because an *Oath* tends or conduces much to God's honour, and to the glory of his Name, by the acknowledgment or confession of his *Truth*, *Knowledge*, *Justice*, and *Almighty Power*; all these four Attributes we acknowledge to be in him, when in

* From hence the Schoolmen aver that it is *Actus latriæ*, or of that worship which is only due to God. Aquin. 22. Q. 89.

in taking of an *Oath* we call upon him to be our witness, and Judge. What can the *Treatist* answer to this? how can he vindicate himself from the guilt of notorious falsity and forgery, by averring that the Bishop asserted, that *Christ* by his prohibitive Precept *exceeded the Prohibition of the Law*, or *Third Commandment*, by commanding us not only not to Swear vainly or falsly, but not to use an Oath in any case whatsoever. Does not that godly *Prelate* in his Tenth Section of his Seventh *Prælection* lay this down for an undeniable conclusion, *Juramenti usus est licitus*, and proves an Oath to be lawful, as by divers weighty Reasons, drawn from the use of it in the Old and New Testament, for that the * Apostle Saint *Paul* and holy *Patriarchs* did use it, and all Controversies were appointed by *Moses* to be terminated or ended by it, *Exod.* 22. 11. so also from the Conditions to be observed in Swearing prescribed by the Prophets, as in that fourth Chapter of *Jerem.* vers. 2. which I have formerly cited and illustrated; after all which he challenges any man to give just Reason, why under the *Old Testament* it should be lawful for holy men to Swear, and not for the Faithful under the *New*, seeing this act of Swearing did not appertain to the *Ceremonial Law*, which was abrogated by Christ, as is evident by the end of it (which is of perpetual use) and that is the confirmation of the Truth, and ending all litigious Disputes and strifes about it. And will not any prudent man conclude from all this, that an Oath in its own and proper nature, is not an evil thing, but lawful and good, when much hurt and many disturbances which may happen in the transaction of humane affairs, may by it be prevented? This is attest-

* Rom. 1. 9. Gal. 1. 20. Gen. 14. 22. 26. 31. 31. 53.

ed by Saint *Paul*, Heb. 6. 16. *An Oath for confirmation is an end of all strife*, i. e. where there is no end of contradicting, there an Oath is expedient; when the Plaintiff affirms, and the Defendant stifly denies, when there is no other way of finding out the Truth, one part of the contradiction being confirmed by the interposition of an Oath, the other part ceases, and so the strife is terminated. Can we imagine then, that the God of peace, unity, and concord, our Lord Christ, would wholly forbid *Swearing*, or the use of an Oath at any time, or in any case, by means whereof, oft-times, as litigious suits and strifes at Law are ended, so *Faith* and *Justice*, the two most firm bonds and ligaments of humane Society, are preserved, (for he that lies under a solemn Oath, dares not be unfaithful or unjust.) I am sure our Saviour never did forbid it, but only the light, rash, and vain use of an Oath in our ordinary and common discourse; this he did, and so our most judicious * Bishop expounds those words of our Saviour, *Matth.* 5. 34. and the same repeated by Saint *James*, Chap. 5. 12. which are the *Quakers* or *Anabaptists* only *Asylum*, to which they flie for Sanctuary, when they are urged to take an Oath by the Magistrate; but I hope they will be effectually beaten, or driven from their *Asylum*, when their shallow and dark understandings are better enlightned, and they being convinc'd, shall acknowledge in their hearts, though they will hardly confess it with their tongues, that the whole weight of their rotten Position hangs upon a weak and slender thread, even one word, *Omninò*, *at all*, which is by them misinterpreted: A good construction whereof is that expression of one *Eusebius* a Gentile Philosopher in * *Stobæus*, *Many* (sayes

* Prælect. 7. Sect. 11. ad finem.

* Serm. 37.

ſayes he there) *exhort men to Swear the Truth*; *but my exhortation to them is*, Ut ne quidem omnino facilè jurent, *That they Swear not at all eaſily*; he means familiarly, without great neceſſity, which is the principal or prime meaning of our Saviours Prohibition, *Swear not at all.*

I ſhould here have given a ſtop to my flying Pen, and taken both it and my wearied hand off from this Paper, had not my Zeal inflamed with indignation ſpurred me on to a juſt vindication of the honour of another holy and more ancient *Father*, moſt renowned (as the former was) in his generation (which was 422. years after Chriſt) for his holy life and ſtupendious knowledge in Divine and Humane Learning, I mean St. *Jerom*, whom the *Impoſtor* or *Treatiſt* challenges as a Patron of his Opinion, ſaying, (though moſt falſly) *That he makes this the reaſon why God indulged the Jews in the uſe of* Swearing, *That they were but in the ſtate of Infancy, and that they might be kept from Swearing by falſe Gods.* I was amazed when I read this, ſo will the judicious Readers be aſtoniſhed at the boldneſs, and madneſs, I may add Falſity and Folly of the *Treatiſt*, in citing the Gloſs of St. *Jerom* upon that Text, *Matth.* 5. 34. it being ſo clearly and wholly againſt him. *Pag.* 11.

The *Father*'s Gloſs is this, which for the benefit of an illiterate *Quaker*, I ſhall tranſlate word for word into Engliſh; *This moſt ungodly cuſtome of Swearing by the Elements was ever in uſe amongſt the Jews, for which they are oft condemned by the mouth of the Prophets. He that ſweareth, either worſhippeth or loves him by whom he ſweareth. We are commanded in the Law to Swear by none but by the Lord our God. The Jews ſwearing*

Hanc per elementa juramenti peſſimam conſuetudinem ſemper habuere Iudæi, &c.

ing by the Angels, by the City of Jerusalem, by the Temple, and by the Elements, gave that honour and worship to the Creatures and carnal things, which was only due to God. But * *consider that our Saviour does not forbid us to Swear by God, but by Heaven, and Earth, by Hierusalem, and by the Head.* Et hoc, quasi parvulis fuerat lege concessum: *and this* (subaud. *he forbids*) *as if it had been permitted to the Jews, as to little Ones; even as they offer'd Victims unto God, that they might not sacrifice the same unto Idols; so they should be permitted to Swear* in Deum *against God; not that they should do well in so doing, but that it was better to exhibit that honour to God* (viz. *by Swearing by his Temple, &c.*) *than to Demons.* From the later part of this Comment beginning at, *Et hoc quasi parvulis, &c.* altogether misconstrued by him, the *Treatist* (though most absurdly) inferrs that *God indulged* (in the opinion of St *Jerom*) *the Jews in the use of Swearing, they being then in the state of Infancy, that they might be kept from Swearing by false Gods.* For St. *Jerom* (or to vindicate him) I appeal to St. *Jerom*; Doth he say any such thing? or do his words sound, or imply any thing to this purpose? I absolutely deny it. He only saith, "*That* "*Christ forbade his Disciples to Swear by Heaven and* "*Earth, &c.* Et hoc, *and forbade this*, quasi, *as if it* "*had been permitted to the Jews in their minority to* "*Swear by them, as it was to offer Victims unto God, that* "*they might not sacrifice them unto Idols.* The Father does not positively affirm that God ever permitted the Jews to Swear by any Creature, he sayes onely *Quasi, as if it had been permitted.* And let the *Treatist* shew me any place in the whole Bible, where ever it was tolerated. But this is not the Dispute now between us.

* Let the Author of the Treatise and his Brethren consider this.

I must

I must only ask him this friendly *Question*, What reason he had to pass by those words of St. *Jerom*, *Consider that our Saviour forbids not us to swear?* He cannot but answer, or I will for him, because it is wholly adverse to his Position: But like as a man that is drowning, catches at any small twig to keep him from sinking, so he to uphold his rotten and corrupt opinion, layes hold on four words of St. *Jerom*, *Concessum fuerat jurare parvulis*, *It had been permitted to little Ones for to Swear*; and wilfully omitting what goes before and follows after, concludes from them (which relate only to Swearing by the Creature) and from *Deut.* 6. 13, 14. "*That God dispensed* "*with the Jews for Swearing by his Name, that he might* "*take them off from Swearing by false Gods, because* "*thereby they would acknowledge them, and not the true* "*God, so that Swearing is only better than Idolatry*; *Therefore in no case good in its own Nature.* In answer to this, I say, that there is a *comparative* without a *positive*, as it is better (say some) to be drunk than to commit Fornication, because this is a complicate sin between two, the other a single one of one individual person. Is it then an evil thing to Swear at all by invocating God's Name? who dares affirm this but an *Anabaptist*, it being an act of Religious Worship, as hath been demonstrated? But I demand again, Did God ever say by *Moses*, or any of his Prophets, *Thou shalt not take my Name into thy mouth in any case, or at any time?* said he ever this without any restriction, or limitation? If he had made this general Proclamation, undoubtedly to take it into our mouths, would be a great and hainous Sin, and so the Jews could not have done it lawfully without a special dispensation

He sayes not *concessum fuit.*

tion from God by the mouth of a Prophet: For God being the Supreme Law-giver, whose Jurisdiction and Dominion is over all, and above all, may *ad placitum* dispense with a Negative Precept that forbids a sin; but then it must be either by an inspired Prophet, or by a voice from Heaven. Now God never did absolutely forbid the Jews to Swear by his Sacred Name, but onely *vainly* or *falsly* in the Third Commandment. And this *Negative* includes an *Affirmative*, *Thou shalt* (when there is an urgent occasion for it) *Swear by my Name Truly.* He therefore that affirms, that, *God dispens'd with the Jews for Swearing by his Name*, (which is in its proper nature absolutely good, because it is allowed of, and enjoyned by God) does in effect say, that it is a sin to invocate, or call upon God, and so falls under the Prophet's curse, *Wo unto him that calls good evil, and evil good.* Consider this thou vain daring man, who dost plead for a *Dispensation* to the Jews, which never came into any mans head to think of but thine; neither hadst thou thought of it, hadst not thou look't by chance into St. *Jerom*, who by his *Concessum fuerat* never intended any such thing as hath been clearly evidenced.

Isa. 5. 20.

Thou mayst as well assert that God dispens'd with the Jews to keep the Sabbath day, that they should not celebrate the Feasts of the Gentiles, as say, That he dispens'd with Swearing by his Name to keep them from Swearing by Idols, or from the Idolatrous Worship of the Heathen Gods; the former as well as the later (though both be frivolous) may be averred. And upon this account it would be as great a sin for Christians to keep the Sabbath, as to swear in any case,

caſe, if God diſpens'd only with the Jews for either: For, a *Diſpenſation* (as it is a comprehenſive term implying a relaxation of an obligation to any command, ſo that a man may do what the Law prohibits, or not do what it enjoynes) is in the opinion of the *Treatiſt* a conceſſion or grant to do that which is evil in its own nature, and not practicable, or to be done but only by the allowance or approbation of the Legiſlator, whoſe will is his Law, as being Supreme.

Now if he can prove by any evidence out of the Goſpel or Evangeliſts, that to Swear is a ſin in its proper nature (with which the Jews, as he falſly aſſerts, were diſpens'd by God) if he can do this (which I know is impoſſible) I will recant what I have writ, and exhort all my Friends and good Chriſtians not to Swear at all.

I am confident that the Author of the Treatiſe was ſtartled, and put to a ſtaining bluſh when he peruſed St. *Jerom's* Gloſs upon our Saviour's words, and met with his * *Conſidera* in the middle of it, "*Conſider that* "*our Saviour here forbade not Swearing by the Name of* "*God*, but only vain, raſh, and impertinent Swearing; ſurely he conſider'd it, but being diſpleas'd with the Holy Man for his opinion, and angry at his Exhortation, ſtudied a revenge, which was to blaſt him with a Lye, and make him guilty of a Contradiction, by ſaying in effect, that what he approved of, was a ſin, yet not diſprov'd of in the Jews by means of God's ſpecial *Diſpenſation*.

* Conſidera quod hic Salvator per Deum jurare non prohibuerit.

From all that has been ſaid in Vindication of Biſhop *Sanderſon*, and the forenamed Father, may be rightly concluded, That the *Treatiſt* has been bred up in the Jeſuits School, in which is taught that Diabolical

Arithmetical Art of *Subtraction*, *Addition* and *Division*, to which may be added that black Art of *Detraction*, for that he to the Bishops Book *De Juramenti Oblig.* has *added* what he never writ; to St. *Jerom* he has *subtracted* (by *dividing* the former part of his Comment from the later) what the Father has plainly published, and is a refutation of what he endeavours to maintain, which is a great Falsity, and repugnant to Scripture Truth; and in all, he has by a foul and dirty Pen *detracted* from both their reputations and credit.

Thus too he hath done by the Reverend Doctor *Gawden* late Bishop of *Gloucester*, and before that of *Exeter*, whom he hath peremptorily listed amongst those who seem to favour his Opinion (as being an *Antijurist*) and laid (as I may say) this *Bastard* at his door, begot by the Father of Lyes, upon an *Understanding* darkned with Errour, and brought forth by the *Midwifry* of an unruly malepert *Tongue*, and nursed up by the help of a virulent *Pen*. But what hath that holy Bishop, that righteous man (whom none can read but with amazement or admiration, both for the flotidness of his *Style*, and *Chrysostome*-like *Tongue*, together with his profundity of *Reason*, and great variety of *Learning*, as is evident by his Printed Works, especially his *Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Suspiria*) what hath he done or said, that they should challenge, or own him for their *Patron*? I'le tell you first what he hath said of *Them*, and then what they quote out of *Him*. First he says of *Them*, "*That they have a* "*canting or Chymical Divinity, which bubbles forth many* "*specious* Notions, *fine fancies, & short-liv'd Conceptions,* "*floating a little in an airy and empty brain, but not en-* "*during the firm touch or breath of any serious Judge-* "*ment.*

In his Discourse concerning Publick Oaths. Pag. 4.

"ment. And Pag. 7. *I profess there appears to me so na-*
"*thing of an excellent or Extraordinary Spirit in them,*
"*that there is much of* Sillineſs, *and not well-catechi'd*
"Ignorance, *ſet off with a great Confidence.* Again,
"*They generally ſeem a buſie, petulant, and pragmatick*
"*ſort of people, meaſuring* themſelves *by* themſelves, *ad-* 2 Cor. 10. 12.
"*miring each other, even in their ridiculous* Affectations, Iud. 8.
"*and* Falſities; *a kind of* Dreamers, *at once* deceiving 2 Pet. 3. 23.
"and being deceived, *doting and glorying in their rude*
"*and contemptuous carriage towards all men, that do not*
"*either favour, or flatter them in their ruſticity and petu-*
"*lancy, which hath in it a great ſeed of Pride and Am-*
"*bition.* And in his Suſpir. Anglic. pag. 73. He terms
"them, *The meaneſt and ſhort-ſpirited men, who in reli-*
"*gious differences, and in the matter of* Ceremonies,
"*do affect to appear moſt cruelly Zealous, and uncharis-*
"*tably pertinacious.* This is the *Character* he gives of
them. But what ſayes the *Treatiſt* of him?

Nothing, I confeſs, derogatory to his perſon, but he quotes, or cites only a remarkable ſaying of his, which makes much againſt the *Anti-Juriſts*, it is this, "*The* Pag. 154.
"*evil of mens hearts and manners, the jealouſies and di-*
"*ſtruſts, the diſſimulations and frauds of many Chriſti-*
"*ans, their uncharitableneſs, unſatisfactions, and inſe-*
"*curities, are ſuch, and ſo great Diſeaſes, as make the*
"*application of* Solemn Oaths *and* Judicial Swearing
"*neceſſary by way of* Conſequence *and* Remedy. What replyes the *Quaker* to this? His anſwer is, That there is no need of theſe applications to him or his Fraternity; and why? *Becauſe, ſorſooth, Chriſt who is the* Pag. 155
Reſtorer of Breaches, and builder of Waſte-places, has redeemed them into Truth-ſpeaking, which takes away the Occaſion of an Oath, and ſuch as are the true, humble,

and faithful followers of this Worthy, *need no Oath to compel them into Truth, to whom it's natural* (My good Friend, I thought it had been a work of Gods Grace) *being freed by it from fraud and falseneſs, and conſequently from* Swearing, *which took occaſion by it to enter into the World.* To all which he ſubjoyns this ſolemn Proteſtation in the name of his *Friends* (as he calls them) *i.e.* his fellow-*Quakers.*

Ibid. *Now we profeſs our ſelves in the fear of Almighty God to be ſuch, as have thus learned Jeſus Chriſt, and for the Reverence, and holy Love we bear to his righteous Command, we cannot take an Oath in any caſe.* In anſwer to this *Profeſſion*, I muſt, *Firſt*, tell the *Profeſſour*, that there is no ſuch command of Chriſt, he never forbade us to Swear in any caſe; this hath been ſufficiently illuſtrated and proved. *Secondly*, he muſt give me leave to be his *Inſtructor* and *Teacher*, and make him underſtand, that his former *Profeſſion* is a *Formal Oath*, as having the Form or Eſſence of an *Oath* in it, which conſiſts in a *Confeſſion* of God and his Almighty Power, as this implies an *Invocation* of God to be a *Witneſs* and *Judge* of what we ſpeak or affirm; and I am aſſured that it is an Untruth what is affirmed by him, *viz. That Chriſt taught us, Not to Swear in any caſe.* So then, the *tantumount* or ſum of their *Profeſſion* is this, *In the preſence of God, whom we confeſs and acknowledge to be* Almighty *and accordingly fear him, becauſe he is able, and will deſtroy us if we profeſs a Lye*—— What is this but a *Form* of *Swearing*, even as Saint *Paul* did, when he made a Profeſſion of his Sincerity, ſaying, *Before God I Lye not?* So the Quaker by an implicite calling upon God to be a Witneſs of what he ſayes, *viz. That he has learned of Chriſt not to Swear at all*, does indeed

Gal. 1. 20.

indeed *Swear*, and that too which is false (for he has not been so taught of Christ) therefore he calls God to witness an Untruth; and what is this but *false Swearing*, which another would cloath with an harder (though proper) term? But as I desire to be *gentle shewing all meekness to all men*, (as Saint *Paul* exhorts) so *parcè loquor*, I forbear to name it, as fearing that I should, by mentioning that, at which my heart trembles, put the poor mistaken man into a new fit of *Quaking*.

Thus a Blasphemer being once rebuked for his Swearing, Swore that he would Swear no more. Tit. 3. 2.

He *protested* that he could not *Swear*, and did it in *protesting*: It seems the man of great Reading and pretended Knowledge, was ignorant of the *material* parts of a *Formal Oath*; so was not another grand *Professor* of *Quakerisme* in *Ireland*, one *E.C.* who is yet living; sparing his Name, I shall faithfully relate what was lately reported to me of him a professed *Usurer*, and *Factour* for some *Merchants* here in *London*. The story of him is this; There was a *Bill* not long since put into the *Chancery* there against him, in a Money business, to which he was commanded to give in his *Answer* upon *Oath*, the which he refused, and after some delayes addressed himself to a worthy person Dr. *W.* one of the Masters of the foresaid Court, proffering him Twenty Pieces in Gold if he would exempt him from *Swearing*, and admit of his *Yea* and *Nay* to his *Answer*, and all *Interrogatories* that should be proposed unto him; the Doctor, as it became him, sent him away with a sharp reprehension for his boldness, and wicked attempt to corrupt him. Upon this he was more bold in petitioning the *Lord Deputy* that his *Yea*, *&c.* might be admitted, but was likewise with a severe check dismissed unsatisfied; at last, when he perceived,

To this Instance some of his party may reply, that he was forced to Swear against his mind upon necessity, but we say, that no honest man will against his conscience Swear a falsity.

perceived, that unless he made *Oath* to his *Answer* he should be non-suited, he dispens'd with his tender Conscience, and took it; after which, there came in such strong evidences against him, that he was found guilty of *Perjury*, and cast in the Suit between him and the *Plaintiff*. By this may be collected what credit is to be given to a *Quaker's Yea* and *Nay*, when as, if the man has a false heart, under the covert of it a *Lye* may be shelter'd.

But leaving him to Christian Pity, and God's mercy, I must return from this short digression, and from the former false *Profession* of the *Treatist* reflect upon his vain *Ostentation*, apparent in his *Protestation* (which goes before it, *Pag.* 155. of the Treatise) *viz. That Christ has redeemed him and the rest of his Combination into Truth-speaking, which takes away the Occasion of an Oath.* What is this but *Pharisaisme*, or proud boasting, becoming a *Thraso* or *Miles gloriosus* in the Comedy, rather than the mouth of a Christian, being one of the many marks which Saint *Paul* fixes upon an unregenerate and carnal man, *Rom.* 1. 30. Moreover he saith, (and what is it but perfect *Pelagianism?*) that *Truth is natural unto them*; if it be the fruit of *Nature*, then it is not of *Grace:* what could have been said more by *Pelagius*, or his Disciple *Faustus!* Omitting a farther Refutation of his vain-glorious and proud *Assertion*, I shall plainly discover unto him the falsity of it by this one direct Syllogisme, *They that are redeemed by Christ into Truth-speaking, to whom Truth is natural, need no Oath to compel them to Truth; but, we the true, humble, and faithful followers of Christ are such*; Ergo, *we need not an Oath.* I could deny the *Major Proposition*, as being false (as I shall prove hereafter;)

Despightful, proud, Boasters.

after;) but for the present I deny the *Assumption* or *Minor*; and to manifest the truth of my denial, I shall not make use (as I might) of a *Sorites* by an enumeration of particular persons among them, and from them whose Lives and Actions have witnessed the contrary, draw a *Negative* Conclusion, I will onely ask the man of *Truth*, I mean the *Professing Treatist*, this one Question, If Truth-speaking, or Veracity be natural to him, and all things by Nature ever the same, without any the least change or alteration (as the *Philosopher* attests) why then contrary to his *Nature* which must argue a perverseness in his Will) and contrary to the *Rules* of common moral Honesty (which argues a pravity in his *Nature*) did he belye two eminent *Fathers* of the Church by endeavouring to perswade the world that they said or writ what they never did? And if Christ's Saints be *redeemed* by him into *Truth-speaking*, then they that make no conscience of a Lye, or *that love, and make a Lye*, are neither Saints nor redeemed by Christ; I am sure Saint *John* reckons them amongst those that shall never enter into Heaven (such are *Sorcerers, Whoremongers, Murderers, and Idolaters*) without an high degree or measure of repentance.

Τὰ τῇ φύσει ὡσαύτως ἀεὶ αἰεὶ ἔχει. *Arist.*

Revel. 22. 15.

Once more, If he be a man of *Truth*, why *walks* not he then *in the Truth*, or as the *Rule* of Truth, the Word of God, directeth? This commands us to *give honour to whom honour is due*, Rom. 13. 7. and to *honour the King*, 1 Pet. 2. 17. This neither he, nor any of his rude Tribe will do, witness his, and his *Associates* unmannerliness, and proud demeanour even towards the *King*, and great persons of *Honour*, to whom they measure the same *Omer* of respect which they do to

2 Ep. Joh. 4.

their

their Equals, and Inferiours, witneſs their *Thouing* and *Theeing* them, and covered heads before them, which betokens no Humility, but much Pride to be in their hearts, proceeding from a pretence, or phanſie that there is a Diviner *Spirit*, and a brighter *Light* in them, than either *Reaſon* or *Scripture*, or great *Reading* affords to others, whereby they think that they have cauſe to glory in their illuminations, and to deſpiſe all thoſe who have not arrived to the pitch or height of their preſumptuous Phanſies. But that unmannerly rudeneſs might be born with, if they would give the *Lord* of Heaven the honour that is due unto him, by obeying his commands, in obeying the *King*'s Laws tending to *Decency*, *Order*, and *Peace* both in State and Church: And becauſe they are reſolved to live and dye in a conſtant oppoſition to all Government, they therefore will take no Oath which may bind them to ſubmit unto it; nay, they will not take an Oath when it is offered by the Magiſtrate, when they might thereby determine a Controverſie between man and man, put an end or give a ſtop to a vexatious Suit in Law, or promote their Neighbours welfare, by giving thereby a firm Teſtimony of his ſuſpected Honeſty: and does not this argue a great want of *Charity?* Nay, a *Quaker* will not Swear though he might thereby ſave his Neighbour's life: and is not this an high piece of *Cruelty?* So obſtinately unmerciful, ſo ſtiffly uncharitable is this *Quaking* Tribe, that as they ought to do no evil that good may come of it; ſo they will not do that which is in it ſelf good (ſuch is the taking of a *Lawful Oath*) to prevent a great evil, damage, or hurt that may or will befall a Neighbour, be it the loſing of an Eſtate.

Heb. 13 17. *Obey them that &c.*

Are

Are ſuch men governed and guided by the good Spirit of Chriſt? I cannot omit here to relate a Story of a *Quakers* obſtinacy, who could not be invited to *Swear* the Truth of that whereof he was an eye witneſs, it is this. * A *Mariner* going to Sea, and being prepared for a long Voyage, gave a Bill of Attorney to his Wife, enabling her to receive his Wages in his abſence; now becauſe (as it is ordered by the *Commiſſioners* for the Navie) no ſuch moneys will be paid unleſs the Bill be atteſted by a Witneſs Sworn before a *Juſtice* of *Peace*, that he was preſent at the writing of it, it happened that a Neighbour poyſoned with the *Quaker*'s Principles (being one of their Diſciples) was only preſent when the *Seaman* writ it, and being deſir'd by his Wife to witneſs the ſame, he refus'd to appear before the *Juſtice*, and could not be perſwaded to take the Oath which was to be miniſtred unto him, by which means the poor woman would be deprived of her maintenance, if her husband had been gone to Sea, and not Tranſcribed the foreſaid Bill in the preſence of an honeſt Man, who thought it no ſinto ſwear for the benefit of another, being aſſured that it was not (as it is not) repugnant to any command of our *Saviour*. Now it is eaſie to determine which of theſe two is the better *Chriſtian*; there is no wiſe man but will give his ſentence for the latter, and not think him worthy of the name of *Chriſtian* who wants that which is the life and ſoul of *Chriſtianity*, and that is (with *Meekneſs* and *Humility*) an Univerſal *Charity* to all men, which is a *diffuſive* Grace prompting a man to be beneficial even to his enemies, and not contract his love and kindneſs only to thoſe who are of his party, and combine with him in his opinions, though they

* I was my ſelf an Ear witneſs of this private Buſineſs.

be repugnant to the truth in the holy Scriptures. Such is the narrow, and short-breath'd *Charity* of the *Anti-Jurists*, whose *Opinion* (or false conceit) of the *unlawfulness*, and *sinfulness* of all *Judicial* and *State* Oaths, is both *unchristian*, as being *uncharitable*, in that as it hinders them from doing good to their Friends and Neighbours, so if it were embrac'd by all (as it never will) it would *impede* in Courts of Judicature the due administration of Justice; it is likewise *destructive* and very dangerous, in regard that the *Safety*, *Peace*, and *Tranquillity* of the *King* and *Kingdom* cannot without Oaths (I mean those of *Supremacy* and *Allegiance*) be secured against the Traiterous plottings, and mischievous designs of domestick and intestine enemies, *Popish Recusants*, and others, *Antipapists* in the points of some fundamental Doctrines, but *Co-papists*, as being Adversaries of the Churches Discipline.

The contrary opinion of the *lawfulness* and *unlawfulness* of the forenamed *Publick* Oaths, is agreeable to the word of God, ratified by the continued *Customes* of this and all other Nations, both *Ecclesiastical*, *Civil*, or *Common*; and approved of by the best of Christians in all ages, by the consonant unanimous Judgements of the ancient *Fathers*, and modern *Writers* of the *Reformed* Churches, (together with the most eminent *Divines* in ours,) it is also confirmed by the *Harmony* of their *Confessions*, both *Lutherans*, and *Calvinists*, by all *Canonists*, and *Casuists*, all of them in a just severity condemning the use of *False*, *idle*, and profane Oaths, assert the Authority of lawful Magistrates (which the *Treatist* and his *Abettors* proudly deny) to require and impose religious Oaths, and declare that it is the duty of Subjects to take them, as it becomes

becomes Chriſtians, with due reverence to the *Majeſty* of God, and fitting obedience to the commands of *Superiour* and *Inferiour Magiſtrates*, who are intruſted with their power from God, and are to uſe it to his glory and the welfare of the *Church* and *Common-Wealth*.

This bright *Cloud* of Witneſſes to the Truth I cannot ſay that I oppoſe to the 200 and 7. Authorities muſtered up in a Catalogue plac'd in the front of the *Quaker's Treatiſe*, for, * moſt of them onely inveigh without any limitation, or reſerve againſt mens eaſie & ordinary courſe of *Swearing* in private converſation, yet holding it lawful both to give and take an *Oath* in great and weighty concerns for a ratification of Truth, and eſtabliſhing of Juſtice. As for ſome others of them cited in his *Catalogue*, they were tainted with the Hereſies of the *Samoſatenians*, *Pelagians*, *Maſſilians*, and the *Euchites*, and of their diſciples or followers in their opinion againſt *Swearing at all*, the *Albigenſes*, and *Anabaptiſts*, to whom we may add the *Meniſts* in the *Netherlands* mentioned by the *Treatiſt*, p. 157. for this reaſon they are not to be held for competent Judges in the caſe, neither are their authorities to be admitted; ſo are the Arguments drawn from the ſayings and practiſes of a few godly Martyrs to be rejected, to wit, of *Baſilides* and *Polycarpus* who onely refuſed Oaths propounded to them which were in the *matter* and *form* of them ſinful, as to ſwear by the *Fortune* of *Cæſar*, which *Polycarpus* denied, or by the *Genius* of the Emperor, which *Baſilides* and *Speratus* refuſed, as is to be ſeen in *Euſebius*. I do therefore conclude, and repeat what I premiſed in my *Preface* that the *Treatiſt's* 207 *Authorities* are to little or no purpoſe, rather

* As Chryſoſt. Auguſtine, Ierome, Athanaſius, &c.

Ponere rationis haud Authorum numero eſt menſuranda veritas.

against, than for him, and his *Co-Anti-Jurists*. Nay, I add and say, put case he had produc'd a thousand more *Authorities* against all kind of Swearing, I would retort to them all with that saying of *Tertullian*. *Non ex personis fidem, sed ex fide personas metiamur*, *we must not measure the Truth by the persons of Men*, as to say it is true *because* such a Learned man said it, but it so *because* the *Word of God* does maintain it; and those persons (though never so holy in outward appearance) are not to be commended, or imitated, who out of a scrupulous, nice, erroneous conscience shall refuse to do that which the same *word* alloweth, so is *Judicial Swearing*. Therefore the poor deceived *Quakers* (whose ignorance I pitty) are in a dangerous error, being *Affirmatively superstitious*, in counting that a duty which is not, and *Negatively*, in abstaining from that as sin, which is no sin, (*i.e.*) from all kind *of Swearing*.

Tert. li. Præscrip. cont. Hær *to this saying of* Tert. *let me add that of* S. Ambrose, Nolo nobis credatur, recitetur Scriptura.

Psal. 53. 5. As presumptuous confidences where there is no Divine permission, so erroneous *fears where no fear* ought to be, are very dangerous, and cast a snare upon the Conscience.

I have one thing more (and that material) to propose to the *Treatist*, that is, whether he was *compos mentis*, and not transported by a whim of Phansie, when he was bold to make a *Proposal* in the Preface of his *Pamphlet* dedicated to the *King* and *Parliament*, that the *Quakers Yea* and *Nay* (which is the mark in their mouths whereby they are known and distinguished from others) may stand for an *Oath*, *they being willing if they should ever be convinced of a Lye* (by promising what they performed not, or asserting an untruth) *to sustain the same Penalty that is usually inflicted*

Pag. 3.

on

on Perjury. What was all this but to desire that the *old* Forms of *State* and *Judicial* Oaths should be altered and turned into *New?* I'le instance onely in the Oath of *Allegiance* (which involves in the body of it that other of *Supremacy*) in the propounding of which to *W. P.* or to any of his *Brethren*, the Magistrate must (if the others request be granted) act the part of a *Catechist*, in these terms: "*Dost thou* W. P. *ac-*
"*knowledge the* Kings Highness *to be the onely Supream*
"Governour *of this Realm, and of all other His* High-
"nesses *Dominions, and Countreys, in all Causes and over*
"*all persons whether* Ecclesiastical *or* Civil, *and do you*
"*promise that you will bear faith, and true Allegiance to*
"*his Majesty, and defend Him to the utmost of your*
"*power against all conspiracies, and attempts whatsoever*
"*against his Crown and Dignity, and do your best en-*
"*deavour to declare, and make known to his Majesty*
"*his Heirs and Successors all Treasons and Traiterous*
"*Conspiracies which you shall know or hear to be made*
"*against him?* To all these interrogations the supposed honest *W. P.* will say *Yea*, and if I break my promise let the Penalty of *Perjury* be inflicted on me. I pray what is all this but *Canting?* cunningness, and craft lies at the bottom of it: What is the punishment of a *Perjured* person? It is to lose his ears in a Pillory, and not to be admitted for a witness in any *Court of Justice*, &c. Now consider how favourable a motion the good man has made for himself and his Brethren! He cannot but know, and be assured of it, that if he breaks his promise, by joyning in a private Conspiracy against the *King*, or by open rebellion raising any popular commotion, or tumults, he will be indicted for *Felony* or *Treason*, and so lose his life in an halter instead of his ears.

And

And what securitie can the *King* have from *W. P.* (or any of his *Tribe*) for his own safety and the *Kingdoms* Peace, or be assured that he will keep his promise, and not be attached for a *Lye* in breaking of it, when he (the supposed prime *Penman* of the *Treatise*) makes no conscience to assert or affirm what is most false, as in the Case of Bishop *Sanderson*, and Saint *Jerom*, hath been demonstrated to his great shame. He that shall once baffle me with a bold lye, I will hardly take his word, or rest in his *Tea*; and he that has *invented*, and publickly *vented* one out of the Press, it may be suspected he will not keep his private promise, and that his bare word will not bind him to an exact performance, which a solemn *Oath* might do, whereby he calls God to be both a *witness* of his promise, and a severe Judge to punish him both in body and soul if he be a *Pronusfragus*. An *Oath* like to the *Angel* with a glittering Sword in his hand, who stopped *Balaam* in his way to *Balak*, is of more force, and energy than a naked word to bind a man to his duty; and there is no man that has an honest heart and meaning, and knows the many temptations he is exposed to from his own corrupt nature, the *Flesh*, the *World*, and the *Devil*, but will chearfully, and solemnly take an Oath, (first praying to God that he may have, by his grace, strength and power to keep it) whereby he may be the more aw'd by fear of God's vindicative Justice, to be faithful and just in the discharge of his duty, or any publick office, which will procure to him the peace of a quiet mind or undisturb'd *Conscience*, which is a great blessing, and is gain'd many times by means of a *Promissory* Oath in *Swearing*.

Num. 22. 31.

There is besides the former *Proposal* of the *Quakers*, a *Que-*

a *Question* put by the Author of the *Treatise*, whom I find to be in divers shapes, sometimes acting the part of a *Pelagian* in saying, that *Truth* (which is a grace of God) is natural to him, next of a perfect *Jesuit*, as in the point of *Dispensation* to the Jews, and his false Citations, and corrupting of the *Fathers*, and now the part of a downright audacious *Quaker*, *Quo te Constringam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?* His *Quære* is this, *Why* their *Yea* and *Nay* may not be admitted instead of an *Oath*, as well as the *Lords* Avouchment upon their *Honour*? by which must be understood *Vertue* in the sense of the best and most ancient *Philosophers*: what does he infer from this, (though he be mistaken in the proper notion of *Vertue*, and belyes too the *Philosophers*?) This is his Inference (or to this effect) *We are* Vertuous persons, therefore *we need not Swear, much less have Oaths impos'd upon us to tell the Truth*, the *onely use of Oaths*. My good vertuous Friend, I must tell thee mildly, this is a Thrasonical brag. But to come to the *Quære*, My answer to it in general is, That it is impertinent, and incongruous, For *first* the *Quaker's Yea* is onely a simple Affirmation to assert the *Truth*, or what has been said or done, a Question to this purpose having been put unto him; But the *Avouchment* of a Lord upon his Honour, is a more solemn Protestation and *Asseveration* of a Truth, and implies an *Option*, or wish, (as an Oath does an *Imprecation*) and the sense or meaning of it (being but an abridgment of his *per Fidem & Allegiantiam meam*) is this, "*As I bear* "*true Faith and Allegiance to my Soveraign Lord the* "*King, so is that which I say most* true, and if I witness an "untruth, or promise what I do not purpose, nor will "perform; let disgrace and reproach fall upon my Honourable

Pag. 14. 15

His words are, Vertue needs not Swear &c.

* This Form was antiently the Lords Protestation.

"nourable person, let me listed amongst those that are "disloyal and not faithful to their King, let me be "counted for a vile person unworthy of any honour, "or respect from men, *&c.*' So that by *Honour* is not meant *Vertue* properly so called, as the *Treatist* fondly imagines, for *Vertue* (or vertuous actions) is onely the ground of Honour, which is, *In honorante* not *in honorato* (as the * Philosopher attests in his *Ethicks*, or Book of *Manners*, which the *Quaker* never studied) *It is in* the *Honourer*, not *in him that is honoured*, being nothing else but an high *esteem* and outward Reverence which men have of, and exhibit to a *Noble* person for his Vertue, for his Piety towards *God*, and Loyalty to his *King*. By this we may collect how the *Treatist* is mistaken, I will not say for want of Learning, to which he pretends by citing many *Authors*, (and it argues a cripple or lame Cause that needs so many Crutches) I rather impute it to his Sophistical crafty industrie, in laying hold on any thing, though it be but one word, by which, and that misunderstood, he may gain a little countenance to his exploded Opinion.

* Aristot.

Besides this he cannot be excused for his Malapert rudeness, who dares put himself into the *Scales* with the best of the Lords (and those vertuous Persons) and conclude, that because in some cases they have a priviledge to attest onely *upon their Honours*, therefore he may challenge the same for his *Yea* and *Nay*, by which many credulous and well-meaning men have been deluded, and drawn into Errours; witness *E. B.* a late Brewer in *Westminster*, who is famous, *rather infamous, for cheating all his* Creditors *to the ruine of many* Families.

Moreover

Moreover I muſt acquaint him, for a further refutation of his bold *Propoſal*, with what I have learn'd from that great *Oracle* of Law, and Law-Caſes, Sir *Ed. Cook* in the 12 Part of his *Reports*, p. 95, 96. There he tells us, that "*If any one who is* Noble, *and a* Peer "*of the Realm be ſued in* Chancery, *he ought to anſwer* "*upon his* Oath; *and, if any Noble perſon be produced* "*as a witneſs between party and party, he ought to be ſworn,* "*or otherwiſe his Teſtimony is of no value; in theſe caſes* "*his atteſtation, or* Avouchment upon his Honour *will* "*not be admitted, though in many others it may and ought* "*to be accepted.*

Furthermore, I muſt in lieu of his *Propoſal* to the *King* and *Parliament* propound a Queſtion to him, which is, whether the *King*, and his *Lords* both *Spiritual* and *Temporal* committed an hainous ſin, when his *Majeſty at his Coronation*, bound himſelf (by a gracious condeſcenſion) in an *Oath* to diſcharge faithfully that great Truſt for the wellfare of the Church and State committed by God unto him, and they likewiſe obliged themſelves by a reciprocal *Oath* to be *True* and *Faithful* to him, with this cloſe, *So help me God*, hereby invocating God to be a *Witneſs* and *Judge* of what they had ſworn, and deſiring no help or mercy from him, if they ſhould ever rebell againſt their *King*? Dares the *Treatiſt* or his *Fellow-Quakers* ſay that they ſinned or broke Chriſt's command by doing it? I preſume they dare not, nay they cannot, without being guilty of a lye; and to ſay that it is a ſin to invocate or call upon God, is no leſs than blaſphemy. From hence I infer, that their general *Theſis*, to wit, *That it is not lawful to Swear in any caſe*, is abſurd, falſe, and ridiculous.

So it is likewiſe of a dangerous *Conſequence*, as tending to the ſubverſion of Order, the deſtruction of good

Manners (which they want) in *States*, *Polities*, and *Common-wealths*, together with the stopping of legal proceedings in *Courts of Judicature* (as hath been proved) and before *Justices of the Peace*. In the foresaid publick Courts of Justice, there is a most necessary use of an *Assertory* Oath to find out the Truth as to particular facts or actions; of a *Promissory* Oath there is not so much need, or use in them: This is necessary in *Publick*, and *Private* matters, which are called by the Lawyers *Extrajudicial*, the use of it in these is to contain Subjects in their *Loyalty* and *Fidelity* to their *King*, for this end were framed the Oaths of *Supremacy*, and *Allegiance*; the first in the beginning of the Raign of Queen *Elizabeth*, the last in the third of King *James*. It is likewise morally necessary to confirm Leagues and Covenants contracted between *Princes* & *Common-wealths*, To the keeping of the *Laws*, and *Statutes*, and consequently the honour, order, and peace of *Colledges*, and *Societies*; To the binding of all publick Officers to an honest and faithful discharge of their duties, To ratifie private bargains between Buyers and Sellers, when it is required by any one of them, who suspects the others Truth and Honesty in his dealings; but in this latter case, I could *wish*, that *Oaths* might be forborn, and rather other means used, with less hazzard to Conscience, such are *Pawns*, and *Witnesses*, *Bonds*, and *Handwritings*.

To the former *Wish*, I shall add another; That all profane and blaspheming *Rabsheka's* would in this one thing imitate the (so called) *Quakers*, (and for which they cannot but be commended) who have so great a fear of an *Oath* as they pretend) that out of a timorous jealousie of Swearing amiss they will *not Swear at all*, by them the other may learn to have a just abhorrence

of

of the sin of easie, trivial, familiar, inconsiderate, and vain *Swearing*, which brings a curse upon a man, and his family, and disposeth men to that horrid Sin, a sin of the first magnitude, that is *Perjury*, or *false Swearing*, of which a *Lye* (most abominable to God) is the Ingredient, besides the affront, irreverence, and dishonour done to God, by calling upon him to witness an *untruth*. Iurandi facilitate in perjurium labimur. Aug.

I have a third *Option*, it is my hearty wish and desire that the *Treatist* and his Confederates would enter their names in the School of *Wisdom*, and learn of *Solomon* this wholesom lesson of *moderation*, *Be not righteous overmuch, neither make thy self overwise, why shouldst thou destroy thy self?* This Precept is of a great extent and latitude, but the learned *Professor* of the *Hebrew Tongue* in *Paris* impales, and confines it within the compass of these three Words, *Ne sis justus nimium*, *Be not over-righteous*, (i.e.) Be not *Severe*, be not *Superstitious*, be not *Perverse*. First, *Be not Severe*, so it concerns the *Judge*, exhorting him by a mild interpretation to mitigate the rigour of the Laws, and not to urge and press the bare letter of them against Offenders, that break them either out of weakness, or ignorance. Secondly, Be not *Superstitious*, so it reaches the *Romanists*, and condemns their works of *Supererrogation*, their going on *Pilgrimage*, their tedious and long journeys to visit the shrines of Saints whom they worship, also their *self-castigations*, their whipping & scourging of themselves, conceiving vainly that these acts are meritorious, and fancying that they shall be justified, and saved by their works. Thirdly, Be not *Perverse*, this sounds an *alarm* to the *Separatists*, the rigid *Antidisciplinarians*, whom this *long* Name well befits, having continued a *long* time for many Eccles. 7.16. Mercerus. Leges moderandas docet nec severius exigendas. ibid. Iusti nimium sunt (i.e.) videri volunt, qui in suis operibus Iustificationem collocant Idem.

years in their opinions, for which, they have neither God's Word, nor right reason for their Defendants, and from whom there is little or no hope that they will be reclaimed, so long as they are guided by their obstinate wills, which they palliate with the specious & abused name of *Conscience*. Their *Sons* begot by them, and their *Scholars*, the poor *Quakers*, first learned of them the Trade of *Separatism*, and are (in this of the same Temper with them) stiffned in *perverseness*. *Solomon*, who died a *Convert*, and repented of his vanities, bespeaks them both (though he be dead) by his lively precept, O vain men, *Be not overmuch righteous*, neither *in doing* that which the *Laws* of the *Church* forbid, (agreeable to the word) *Do not separate*, neither *in not doing* what God allows in his Word, *Do not refuse to take an Oath*, when there is a great need of it, and when it is required of thee by the *Magistrate*, who is the *Kings* Deputy, as he is *God's* vicegerent who commands you to *obey them that have the rule over you*, in things lawful, and so you obey them in the Lord, both in respect of the *Commander* and the things *Commanded*.

Of this opinion is S Ambrose l 2. Apol. pro Davide. with others of the Fathers. Iude 19. Exod 22. 11.

Heb. 13. 17.

To that exquisite gloss of *Mercerus*, I cannot omit to subjoyn another of the great *Scripturist Deodatus* (once *Professor* of *Geneva*) upon the forecited Text of *Ecclesiastes*, which in my opinion comes home to an obstinate *Quaker*, or any other *Dissenter*, his numerical words are these. "*Be not* bent *too much upon a* "*thing which in thy opinion is* just, *without yielding any* "*way either in Charity*, *or* wise *integrity to the opinion of* "*others*, *to the necessity of times*, *and humane frailty*. Surely this holy man would have told an *Anti-jurist* if he had discoursed with him, that he was *overmuch righteous* by his refusing to *swear at all*, and maintaining it to be sinful in others to swear in any case, when the suspi-

cions,

cions, jealousies, frauds, and falsities of men require an *Oath*, or make it necessary in *Judicial* proceedings. The same *Commentator*, who had an extraordinary gift from God (as his name imports) in expounding the Sacred word, says thus in his Comment upon *Mat.* 5. 34. (The Text which is mis-interpreted by the *Anabaptists*) "*Seeing that an* Oath *is a means, and an help to* "*Truth, and to proof, appointed by God, and oftentimes* "*very necessary, we must restrain this command of Christ* "(*to wit*, Swear not at all) *to voluntary Oaths, not requi-* "*red by them who have Authority, vain, frivolous and vici-* "*ous Oaths, seeing those things which are set down here* "*have relation onely to such.*

Be not righteous overmuch (perverse *Separatist*) *for why shouldst thou destroy thy self*, (i.e.) (as *Tremelius* upon the Text) *By thy pride and arroganey run headlong into destruction*, by undergoing the penalties of the Laws here, and endangering the salvation of thy soul hereafter. *Separation* from the Church his mystical *Body*, is a dividing from Christ the *Head*. Col 1. 18. Eph. 1. 15.

In the last place, and for a close of all, I do earnestly desire the *Heads* and *Abettors* of the *Quaking* party to afford me so much Charity, as to believe, that I had no other design in undertaking the *Refutation* of their *Treatise* (put into my hands by a most religious knowing person) but onely their *Conviction*, and *Conversion*. For when I had read, what is the sixth of eleven things which they desire to be considered, *viz. That their* Refusal to Swear in all cases, is a matter of *Faith, and whatsoever is not of Faith is Sin*, I pitied their mistake, (as to the former part of their Position) and conceived it my duty (with others of the *Clergy*) to undeceive them poor mistaken souls, by demonstrating that as it is usual with God, *to send men* (as the Apostle *Pag.* 155, 156, 157.

2 Thes. 10. 11. Apostle speaks) *strong delusions to believe a lye, because they received not the love of the Truth, that they might be saved*; so *They* believe that to be true which is apparently false, and that it is a sin to do, what they (though falsly) believe ought not to be done, (*i. e.*) *To Swear* by the Name of God, although it may be for God's glory in the vindication of the Truth, or to promote a Neighbours good.

My next design was (which is every mans duty) to prevent the *Contagion* which might spread amongst the poor people from their * *Gangreen-Opinion*; for whilst they profess *Conscience* for their disobedience, & alledg Scripture (though misconstrued) for their *Conscience*, and colour all with an appearance of outward Sanctity in their lives, not usually tainted with debauchery, and drunkeness, it may be justly feared that the *Populacy*, if not fortified by pregnant demonstrations of Truth against their spreading errours and Opinions, will cry up their Piety (they appearing for a great part of them morally Just, and civilly Innocent, as were some of the refined Heathens) and by degrees joyn with them in their Confederacy against the *Laws* of the *Kingdoms*, and the *Churche's Constitutions*, there being sown in the hearts of the people the seeds of *Rebellion*, *Faction*, and *Sedition*, which are oftimes sad effects of *Conventicles*, or *private Meetings*, called by a learned *Greek* Father (from the sad experience he found of them) *Dens* of *Thieves* or *Robbers*, for that the *Meeting-Masters* steal the hearts of Subjects from their *King* and *Governors*, of Wives from their Husbands, and of these from their Wives, of Children from their Parents, of Servants from their Masters; for there can be no true love or affection, where there is a difference of Opinion, and Practice, whilst

* 2 Tim. 2. 17. Their word will eat as doth a Canker.

Σπήλαια Λῃστῶν, Epiphan.

two

two or three of a Family go to *Conventicles*, and the rest to open *Churches* to joyn with Gods Saints, and Servants in the publick Service of God, as it is enjoyned by the fourth Commandment. He likewise terms them Κατοικητηρια δαιμονων, *The Receptacles of evil Spirits*, such as filled and possessed the hearts of *Judas*, and *Simon Magus*, and may possess the hearts of many of the *Leaders* and *Teachers* in them.

For a *Corbnis* or *superpondium* of all that hath been writ in the defence of the Legality of a *Judicial*, and in some cases of a *private* Oath, I desire the *Treatist* once more to consider what he hath said *Pag.* 27. of his *Treatise*. *Take away lying and there remains no more ground for Swearing*; He should have said, there will be no ground for *Perjury*; For suppose a man never told a *Lye*, yet if an Oath should be required of him by the Magistrate to vindicate his own, or anothers suspected Honesty and Truth, he would have a good ground for his Swearing in this Case, he being commanded to do it; so that the *Treatist's* Proposal is vain, as it is likewise of a thing that is impossible. For as *there must be Heresies* (*i. e.* they cannot be hindred) so there will be (as long as the world lasts) *lying*, or false-speaking, with dissimulation amongst men, *Ergo*, by the *Quakers* own concession, there will be a necessity of *Swearing*. Thus I may retort and say, the *Anti-Jurist* is (as the Giant *Goliah* was) wounded with his own weapon, refuted by his own Argument. 1 Cor. 11. 19. 1 Sam. 17. 51.

But I shall not (out of my tender pity and regard to his Soul, and to the deluded Souls of his Disciples) leave him gasping and bleeding under his *wound*, but as I formerly praised him, and them for their pretended awful reverence to Gods holy Name, so (as it becomes a merciful Soul-Physician, & as the good *Samaritan* did to the wounded *Traveller*, *Luke* 10.) I shall pour the oyl of my prayers into

into his *wound*, beseeching God the Father of mercyes so to open his, and the eye of their understandings (as he did the eyes of *Balaam*) and the door of their hearts (as he did open *Lydia's*) that they may (laying aside all prejudice) attend to those saving Truths which have been delivered in this *Anti-Treatise*, and (being convinced of their errors) submit with a due, and humble *obedience* (according to the will of God) to the wholsom Laws of the *Realm*, and to the *Churches* laudable constitutions; that so they and we may *meet* now together in love, unity and concord, and hereafter in the *great Congregation* of Heaven above, into which none shall be admitted but only those, who are the true and lively members of *Christ* their *Head*, who are animated, quickned, and guided by his good Spirit the spirit of *love*, and *unity*, (which rests not in the breast of a perverse malicious *Schismatick*) and the spirit of *Truth*, wherewith the soul of a proud obstinate *Heretick* (who maintains and propagates opinions repugnant to the word of God) is not enlightned. From that *Venom* of *Schism*, and this *Pest* of *Heresie*, *Lord* preserve and defend thy *Churches*. And so sanctifie the Hearts, and govern the Tongues of all profane *Swearers*, that (being aw'd by a trembling fear of those dreadful Judgments, which have in all ages fallen upon such *miscreants*) they may with thankful *lips*, and by the holiness of their *lives* advance thy glory, and publish thy praises. O let thy *mercy* be glorified in their *Conversion*, and not thy *Justice* magnified in their *Confusion*. This I humbly beg in the behalf of them, and all *Dissenters* from the Orthodox Professors of thy *Truth*, and sound *Religion*, for thy mercies sake and alone merits of thy beloved *Son* our Lord and only Saviour Christ Jesus. *Amen.*

Num. 22. 31.
Act. 16. 14

FINIS.

A Jury of 12 Quakers.

William Penn, Foreman.

Alexander Parker,	*Samuel Newton*,
George Whitehead,	*Thomas Heart*,
Stephen Crisp,	*John Osgood*,
William Mead,	*James Claypoole*,
Gerrard Roberts,	*Thomas Rudyard*,
William Welsh,	*Richard Richardson.*

THE Anti-Quaker:

OR,

A Compendious *Answer* to a tedious Pamphlet, Entituled,

A Treatise of Oaths,

Subscribed

By a Jury of 12 *Quakers*, whose names are prefixed to it, together with the *Fore-man* of that Jury, the *Ring-leader* of that Tribe, and Head of that Faction, *William Penn*,

Alledging several Reasons why they (no cases excepted) refuse to swear, which are refuted, and the Vanity of them Demonstrated both by Scripture, Reason, and Authority of Ancient, and Modern Writers.

By MISORCUS,

A Professed *Adversary* of Vain *Swearing* in common discourse, and communication.

Fear God and keep his Commandments, For this is the whole duty of man, Eccles. 12 13.

Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God: him shalt thou serve, and cleave unto him, and swear by his Name, Deut. 10. 20.

LONDON,
Printed for *R. Royston*, Bookseller to his most Sacred Majesty, at the Angel in *Amen-Corner*, 1676.

THE Anti-Quaker:

OR,

A Compendious *Answer* to a tedious Pamphlet, Entitled,

A Treatise of Oaths,

Subscribed

By a Jury of 12 *Quakers*, whose names are prefixed to it together with the *Aggregate* of that Jury, the *King-Jeffery* of that Tribe, and Head of that Faction, *William Fox*.

Alledging several Reasons why they (the calls Excepted) refuse to swear, which are refuted, and the Vanity of them Demonstrated both by Scripture Reason, and Authority of Ancient, and Modern Writers.

By Misoccus,

A Professed *Adversary* of Vain Swearing in common discourse, and commonly [illegible].

Fear God and keep his Commandments, For this is the whole duty of Man. Eccles. 12. 13.

Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God; him shalt thou fear, and shalt thou hear, and swear by his Name. Deut. 10. 20.

LONDON,

Printed for *R. Royston*, Bookseller to his most Sacred Majesty, at the Angel in *Ivy-Lane*, 1676.

TO
The most Judicious

View of the Right Honourable the *Lords* and *Commons* Assembled in the High Court of Parliament.

THE unworthy Author most Humbly presents the ensuing *Treatise*, as the 13 Head-Quakers did of late most boldly dedicate their's, *Subscrib'd* by them *on the behalf of the rest of their Friends* (they are their own words) with an earnest supplicate to be freed from the imposition of all Oaths, which *for pure conscience*

ſake (as they ſay) *they cannot take at all*, concealing (what is their main drift) their deſire to obtain a free uſe for the future of their private Meetings, or *Conventicles*, the *Seed-plots* of faction, and ſeditious practiſes, as St. *Auguſtine* proves at large in divers Epiſtles to the then Raigning Emperours, againſt the *Donatiſts* (the *Quakers* Progenitors) commending to them by way of advice this moderate *State-maxime*, *Doctrina præcedat, Diſciplina ſequatur.*

With reſpect to the former part of it I have (as many of my *Brethren* in the Miniſtry have learnedly done before me) imployed my weak endeavours for the ſatisfaction of their ſcrupulous Conſciences, referring the execution of the latter part

part of it, for severe *Discipline*, to your *Honours* great Authority, and most Sage Counsels; for a blessing on which, *to the advancement of Gods glory, the good of the Church, the safety, honour and welfare of our Soveraign and his Kingdoms*, with the publick you have the daily private Prayers and Supplications of him who conceales his *Name*, not out of a guilty Fear, but a cautious Prudence, not willing to have it aspers'd with reproaches and unjust calumnies, with bitter railings and Invectives, against which there is no fence from the most unspotted Innocence, and wherewith they usually bespatter those who dissent from them in their vain, false, and Antiscriptural opinions, which they cannot maintain either by Gods holy Word,

*Corrigi eos cupimus non necari, nec Disciplinam circa eos negligi. Aug. Ep. 127.

or

or any rational Arguments, as I shall (God assisting me) Prove, and Illustrate in the following Treatise, presented in all Humility to your *Honours* for its Patronage, not doubting of your gracious pardon for the boldness of my Dedication.

THE REFUTER'S Preface.

THERE *is a Generation* (saies *Solomon*, Prov. 30. 12.) *that are pure in their own eyes, and yet are not washed from their filthiness*; a sort of men that *walk after the Flesh in the lust of Uncleanness, and despise Government, presumptuous, self-willed, and that are not afraid to speak evil of Dignities*, (or those that are set over them by God to be their Rulers and Governours) 2 *Pet.* 2. 10. yet, being swell'd with a Tympany of Pride, are admirers of themselves, even to the contempt of others. I heartily wish, for their Souls sake, that this Character of St. *Peter* and *Solomon* might not justly be appropriated to some of the *People called*

led *Quakers*, who refuse to Swear, and will not be tied to the discharge of their Duties by Oaths ministred unto them by Subordinate Magistrates, whereby they deserve to be more properly called (as they are indeed) *Anabaptists*; *Quo genere hominum nullum aut pertinacius aut arrogantius, aut in erroribus aut figmentis feracius*, so the judicious *Cramerus* in his third Classis of Hereticks, *cap.* 4. *Than whom no kind of men are more pertinacious and arrogant, and more pregnant in the propagating of false and erroneous Opinions*; of which (amongst divers others) this is one, *That it is not lawfull to Swear in any case whatsoever:* and this opinion they ground upon our Saviours Precept or Injunction, *Matth.* 5. 34. The proper sense and meaning of which Precept when I have fully demonstrated, both from the *occasion* of his delivering it, and from the *scope* or *intention* of it; confirming my Interpretation by the joynt consent of the best Interpreters, also by the strength of divers weighty Reasons; it will appear to all judicious Readers, that the foresaid Tenet is both absurd, false, and frivolous; and that all their numerous Allegations or Testimonies to the contrary (which are no fewer than 207.) out of the Writings of *Gentiles*, *Jews*, and *Christians*, are to little or no purpose, of no validity to maintain the *Quaker's Thesis* or *Position*, in regard that most of them only inveigh against Perjury and ordinary or common Swearing in our familiar Discourses, which was chiefly intended (as it shall be evidently proved) by our Saviours Prohibition, *Swear not at all.* Upon the *rind* or *shell* (*i. e.* the Letter) of which words the forenamed feed so much, and gnaw the *Bone*, that they never

never come at the *Kernel* and *Marrow*, or true *meaning* of them.

Before I proceed to the explication of this *prohibitive* Precept, I must take leave to commend to the view of the people that go under the name of *Quakers*, (or rather to the Pen-men of that *Treatise*) a Saying of a Christian Divine Philosopher; *There was never any Truth, though ratified by the Authoritie of God's Word, which had not a Lye for its Attendant*; which must not be so understood, as if *Truth* were the natural Parent of a *Lye*; but in regard of the malice and perverseness of men who did darken it with their misty Glosses, and corrupt it by their wresting of it, with false Interpretations. Thus the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, like many in our Dayes, had learned this Art of spreading and maintaining their false Doctrine, by corrupting the Sacred Text. For, whereas God, commanding us to have in due and awful Reverence his holy Name, forbade the *Jews*, and in them us Christians, to *take the same in vain*, Exod. 20. 7. *i.e.* to take it into our mouths idly, or to no purpose, without any warrant from Necessity, and without respect to the advance of his Glory; the *Scribes* or Doctors of the Law expounding לשוא *in vain*, by לשקר *falsly*, i. e. to back and confirm a Lye, which word we find, *Levit.* 19. 12. *Thou shalt not Swear by my name falsly*; they hereby confounded two distinct Precepts. For, by the later in *Leviticus* is forbidden Perjury, which is the confirmation of a Lye by an Oath: by the former Precept in *Exodus* all vain, inconsiderate and rash Oaths, which men commonly use to confirm or ratifie the Truth in their

Πάντι λόγῳ καὶ δόγματι ἀληθείας παρεφύεται τὸ ψεῦδος *Athenag.* l. de Resurrectione.

private Negotiations, Contracts, Bargainings, and Discourse.

From this false Gloss of the *Scribes* interpreting the Third Commandment, as if only *Perjury* were forbid by it, and this too only in the abuse of God's Sacred *Name*; from this corrupt Spring issued these three perverse and depraved Doctrines, which in our Saviour's time were setled in the minds and hearts of the deluded Jews.

First, to Swear by the *Creature*, and to forswear, they affirmed to be no sin.

Secondly, they counted it no breach of the Third Commandment, if they used in their ordinary discourse the *Name* of God, so long as they did what they promised, and affirmed what was true. With the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* in this Second Opinion agree both *Maldonat* on *Levit.* 19. and *Socinus* with his followers.

Thirdly, from this later impure Stream or Opinion issued another, as corrupt and unsound; it was this, That whatsoever they had bound themselves to by an Oath in the Name of God, they were obliged to do it, were the thing never so unjust and bad.

Our blessed Saviour, as it did become so wise a Teacher *who came from God*, as *Nicodemus* witnessed of him, *Joh.* 3. 2. intending and endeavouring to root out of the peoples minds these *Pharisaical* Doctrines, or Principles unsound in themselves, and destructive of an holy Life or good Manners, in his First Sermon *Ad populum* on the Mount, gave them all, as it were, their deaths Wound, stifled and choak'd them with one general Precept or Prohibition, strengthened with Divine Authority, the Authority

thority of his own Person, *But I say unto you, Swear not at all*; i.e. *Swear not at all per ullam rem creatam*, by any thing created, or which is the Workmanship of God, for by so doing you will attract to your selves the guilt of Idolatrie, by ascribing to the Creature that which is proper and essential to the Creatour, i. e. *omniscience*, and *omnipotency*, as if it knew our hearts and secret intentions, and could punish us if we should be guilty of Perjury. With the forenamed *Beza* in the Margine concurrs his Compatriot, and no less Learned *Calvin* in his Comment on the Text, whose assertion is this, *Particula* omnino *non ad* jurandi *Verbum refertur, sed ad subjectas Sacramentorum formulas*, i. e. *The Particle* At all *is to be referred not to the words which go before* Swear not, *but to the which follows, Neither by* Heaven — *nor by the* Earth — *neither by* Hierusalem — *nor by thy* Head — By this our Saviour gave a check to the Scribes first Doctrine, *viz.* That to Sweat by the Creature was no sin.

Beza in l. Ex proximè sequentibus quas Christus damnat formulis liquet, non ipsum jusjurandum reprehendi.

Secondly, as this Prohibition, *Swear not at all*, excludes the *Creatures*, be they the holy *Evangelists*, *Saints* departed, or *Angels*, (whom to invocate, as in Prayer, so in Swearing, is held to be lawful by the *Romanists*, as it was by the *Manichees*:) so it includes and forbids all vain and superfluous Oaths in use then among the Jews, and now too frequently used by Christians in their common and familiar Discourses. That this was likewise our blessed Saviours meaning, may be evidenced by that which follows by way of Precept after the Prohibition, *But let your communication be Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay*, i.e. In your common talk and discourse use only a bare *Affirmation* of what you know to be true, and a simple *Negation* of what

Epiph. an. l. 1. c. 19.

Vers. 37.

you

you are assured is false, without interposing the dreadful and Sacred Name of God. *Let your communication be Yea, Yea,* &c. On which words *Ugo* thus Glosses, *Let not thy actions give thy words the Lye: what thou hast affirmed or promised with thy tongue, ratifie the same by thy action: and what thou hast denied in thy words, confirm not the same by thy deeds.* This Gloss is ingenious, and might be embraced, if Christ had said only, *Let your Yea be Yea,* &c. but these words, *Let your communication*--- being prefixed to the *Yea, Yea,* imply and require another (and that more proper) interpretation, which may be this, Because men usually swear, that, what they affirm or deny, may be fully credited or believed; our blessed Lord therefore commands us rather to use a double Affirmation, saying, *Yea, Yea*; and a double Negation, *Nay, Nay,* than rashly swear by Gods holy *Name*: By which to swear (and that in their familiar discourses) the Jews in our Saviours time thought it (as was said before) lawful, (and so they had been taught by the Scribes) in case the thing was true which they had sworn. And forasmuch as they deemed it not to be Perjury (or thought they were not perjured) if they had Sworn only by the Creatures and broke their Oath, misinterpreting that Text, *Exod.* 20.7. *Thou shalt not forswear thy self, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine Oaths:* Our Saviour for these reasons (and this was the scope only, or intent of his Prohibition) said unto them, *Swear not at all*; Swear not by the *Creature* (to do this is *superstitious* and *idolatrous.*) Swear not *rashly* nor *lightly*; this is *prophane* and *blasphemous.* Swear not *falsly*; this is to back a Lye with an Oath, upon which follows the guilt of Perjury. Lastly, Swear not *unjustly*, bind not

Quod dicis verbo dic opere, quod negas verbo noli confirmare facto. *Ugo.*

B. 24.

not your self by an Oath to do what is against the rule of Justice or Honesty; by this you make an Oath to be *Iniquitatis vinculum*, a bond of Iniquity, which is rather to be broken with repentance and sorrow of heart for taking of it, than kept. Such was *Herod's* rash Oath to the wanton Daughter of *Herodias*, to give unto her whatsoever she should ask: Such was that of the *Jews*, who bound themselves under a Curse, saying, *That they would neither eat nor drink, till they had killed Paul.* Mark 6. 23. Act. 23. 14.

The *Prohibition* of Christ being thus explained, (for which I have the consent of the most and best Interpreters, both modern and ancient, whose names are so numerous, that the Margine cannot contain them) to that Explication I shall subjoyn many undeniable and weighty Reasons, to evince and prove the falsity and absurdity of the *Anabaptist's Tenet*, or *Thesis* (which is grounded upon that general *Prohibition*) *That in any case whatsoever it is not lawful for a Christian to swear.* For the disproving, and refuting of which dangerous Position (and that I may reconcile *Moses* to *Christ*, the *Law* to the *Gospel*, many Texts in *Deuteronomy*, and in the *Prophets*, which enjoyn us to *Swear* by the Name of God, to the prohibitive command of our Saviour) let me premise this for an undeniable Maxime or Thesis, *That the Precepts of the Gospel are not repugnant, or contrary to the Commands of the Law.* This Position is defended and proved at large by S. *Augustine* in his Nineteenth Book against *Faustus* the Heretick, *Cap.* 16. What the Law commands, the Gospel does not forbid; and what the one forbids, the other does not allow: but both meet together in a sweet consent and harmony of Truth, and Deut. 6. 13. 10. 20. Isa. 65. 16. Jerem. 12. 16. Præcepta Evangelii non contrariantur præceptis legis. *Aug.*

XUM

and (as it were) kiss and embrace each other; so that the Gospel in a manner bespeaks the Law in the words of that *Parasitical* Servant in the *Comedie* to his Master, *Quod ais aio, quod negas nego*, what you command I commend, what you condemn I disallow; and there is no surer or better way of expounding the Law than by the Gospel, and of the Gospel than by the Law, according to that known saying of *Irenæus*, l. 4. c. 63. *Secundùm Scripturas expositio legitima est, & sine periculo, It is the safest course and method for the ending of Disputes, to expound Scripture by Scripture, one Text by another, if there be a seeming difference in the former from the later.*

Now I must put this Question to a dissenting *Quaker*, to any one of the People so called, Dost thou imagine, or darest thou say, that *Moses* and the Prophets borrowed not their Light of Revelation or Doctrine from Christ the everlasting *Sun* of *Righteousness* (who likewise being the Eternal *Word* of God, spake to them by his Spirit, and dictated to them what we find in their Writings, as Rules of our Faith and Manners?) I presume thou wilt not say it; and unless thou wilt assert, that they were not true *Stars*, but only slimie *Meteors* coloured with shews and pretences of Truth, and that their Doctrine is false; unless thou assert this (which is an horrid and hainous crime, even blasphemy, but to think) and I know thou wilt not, then thou must set thy Seal to this undeniable Truth, that in some cases it is not unlawful or sinful to use an *Oath*, according to that of the Prophet *Jeremiah* in his Exhortation to revolted *Israel*, *Thou shalt swear, The Lord liveth, in Truth, in Judgment, and in Righteousness.* i. e. When thou makest

Mal. 4. 2.

Jerem. 4. 2.

or

Judicio caret juramentum insolutum, veritate juramentum mendax, Justitia juramentum iniquum & illicitum. Aquin.

or takest an Oath, thou shalt swear by the Eternal Lord of Life, who is a discerner of the mind and heart, to whom are clearly known the inward motions of it, who will likewise severely punish us if we be false in our sayings, and unjust in our doings. This profession we make when we invocate him in taking of an Oath, being called to it by the *Magistrate*, and hereby God's name is sanctified, (it being an extraordinary part of God's worship) but with this *proviso*, That the three forenamed Cautions or Circumstances mentioned before by the *Prophet* do attend it. They that thus Swear by Gods Name *shall be commended*, Psal. 63. 12. *i.e.* They that swear in weighty matters (when they are urged to it) either for the confirmation of the Truth, or to maintain their suspected Innocency, and oblige themselves by an Oath before a Magistrate to do that which is righteous, just, honest, and good; such men sin not, neither offend against our *Saviour's*, or S. *James* his Prohibition, *Swear not*, chap. 5. 12. by which is condemned and forbid only rash and inconsiderate, false and dishonest *Swearing*, approved not of by the Laws of men, and condemned by the Word of God, by which the contrary is commended, *Isa.* 65. 16. *He that Sweareth in the earth shall Swear by the God of Truth.*

To my former Position and Question proposed to a Scrupulous *Quaker* (or rather *Anabaptist*) I shall add another *Quere*, which I desire him to consider; it is this, Whether Christ's Assertion and Testimony of Himself be not true, *Matth.* 5. 17. *I came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it.* I cannot expect, if I should talk with him, but that he would say in his proper Language, *Tea.* This being granted (as he dares not deny

deny it, then I would reply, and tell him, That if Christ came *not to destroy the Law*, then he forbade not what the Law commands; and if he came to *fulfil it*, then he must acknowledge that Christ did that for which he came into the World (for his coming was not in vain, or frustrate) and that He (*in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead*, i.e. who is perfect God and man in one person, and in whom there is a fulness of Wisdom and all heavenly Grace) *fulfilled* the Law two manner of ways, *here & ore*, by his *Works* and *Words*, or Divine Doctrine.

Aquin. 12. 101. Q. 2. Art

First, by his Works or Deeds, in that, to leave us an Example of a meek heart and found obedience, he submitted himself to the *Ceremonial* Law, being circumcised the Eighth day, &c. So likewise to satisfie the rigour of God's Justice, he fully performed the *Moral* by his active obedience, doing what the Lord required of us to be done, thereby to bring us to Heaven; and by his *Passive*, suffering for our Sins to redeem us from the pains and torments of Hell.

Verum legis sensum exprimendo.

Præcepta legis ordinando ut tutiùs observaretur quod lex vetuerat. Aquin

Secondly, he fulfilled the Law by his heavenly Doctrine, this he did by explaining the full scope, the intent or meaning of the Law (as in those two Cases of *Murder* and *Adultery*, Matth. 5. 21, 27.) and by prescribing Rules for the better observing of the Laws *Affirmative* and *Negative* commands.

Thus, because the Law forbids all kinds of *Perjury*, *Thou shalt not Swear by my Name falsly*, Lev. 6. 3. that this *Prohibition* might be the better kept and observed, and men secured from the danger of so great a sin (in regard that men accustomed to Swearing, account *Perjury* but a light and frivolous thing) Christ therefore in his Sermon upon the Mount, gave to his

Auditors;

Auditors or Disciples a safe and wholsom admonition, *Swear not at all*, i.e. never, *nisi in causâ necessitatis* (as the Learned *Zanchy* upon that Text) except in cases of Necessity, *Ubi gloria Domini vindicanda, aut fratris ædificatio promovenda*, when and where the glory of God is to be vindicated by a bold defence of the Truth opposed, and when our neighbours welfare may thereby be promoted, and either our own credit or reputation preserved. St. *Chrysostome* himself (who was a rigid enemy to *Swearing* (i.e. to vain and idle *Oaths* in mutual and private Conference) and in whose mistaken and wrested Sayings the Pen-man of the *Treatise against Oaths* does much * triumph) he in his Fifth Homily *Ad pop. Antioch.* does clearly admit of, or allow an Oath to be taken in a case of Necessity, as is evident by these words, (cited in English, p. 72. of the Treatise) "*Moreover, this I say, That in the mean time we may cut off Superfluous Oaths, those I mean, which are made rashly amongst Friends and Servants without any Necessity*, &c. Hence I infert (having great and weighty Reasons which hereafter I shall produce, and that florid golden mouth Father's warrant for my Assertion;) That as *Necessity* (as we say commonly) has no Law; so to take an *Oath* when a man is necessitated or compelled to take it, is not superfluous, vain, or sinful, and no violation of *Christ's* Precept, or of *Moses* his Law, I mean the Third Commandment, *Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain*: for if every *Negative* Precept does include (which no man will deny) the contrary to it, which is the *Affirmative*, we may then inferre, and say with *Moses* (who spake from God) *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God*,

* The Author has stuff'd two and twenty Pages in his Treatise with Citations out of that most Eloquent Father, which are nothing to his purpose; for St. Chrysostome condemns not all kinde of Swearing.

Necessitas tollit ferias. Prov. Heb.

Deut. 6. 13.

God, and serve him, and shalt Swear by his Name, not vainly, or to no purpose, but to justifie the Truth, or to give to thy Neighbour (who requires it) an assurance of thy integrity, or sincerity of thy promise; and in other cases which are warranted by an inevitable *Necessity*. Thus if any one should accuse thee of perfidiousness or slander, as having with the black tooth of Calumny wounded his reputation, or defrauded him of his goods; If thou, to purge thy self from this foul aspersion, shalt deny the fact by a simple and bare protestation of thy innocency, and he still suspecting thee to the contrary shall require an *Oath* of thee, to confirm his belief of what thou denyest; in such a case, to vindicate thy credit, and to work out of his mind that injurious suspicion, thou mayest use a solemn *Attestation*, by invocating or calling God to witness the Truth of thy Assertion. And that in such or the like case (to settle in another a perswasion of our Integrity) an *Oath* between private persons is no sin; we have the examples of God's Saints in the holy Scriptures to warrant it, as that of *Abraham*, who being urged to it by *Abimelech* King of *Gerar*, did Swear unto him that he would not deal falsly with him, &c. The like *promissory* Oath passed between *Jacob* and *Laban*, *Gen.* 31. 53. and from *Boaz* to *Ruth*, Chap. 3. 13. Let me annex to these Examples the testimony of Saint *Augustine*: When Christ (saves he) enjoyned us to use in our common discourse, by way of Affirmation and Negation, *Yea, Yea, Nay, Nay*, He said not that whatsoever is more than this is evil or sin, but *proceeds from evil*, i.e. *from some bad principle, from the evil of infirmity* in him, who requires an Oath, and that is his *incredulity*, suspecting the Truth of the others Narration

Gen. 21. 23, 24.

Aug. l. 10. de Serm. Dom. c. 30.

tion

tion or Report, or his want of *Charity*, entertaining in his breast a bad opinion of his Brother, and perhaps undeservedly; *Tu enim non male facis qui benè uteris juratione*, &c. *For thou doest not ill who usest an Oath well* (i. e. to a good end) *that thou mayest beget in another a firm belief of the Truth, and of thy sincerity: He rather doeth ill whose diffidence or distrust enforces thee to use an Oath; his sin shall not be imputed to thee.*

For the farther ratification of my former *Position* concerning an *Oath's* legality, in case of an undeniable and inevitable *Necessity*, I shall propound one *Quære* more to *W. P.* the Quakers Oracle or Antesignanus of the *Anabaptists*, it is this; Suppose a knot of Thieves should assault thee in thy journey, and, having by force and violence robbed thee of thy money, should urge thee to Swear that thou wilt not betray nor prosecute them by raising the Country to a pursuit of them, in the mean time affrighting thee with execrable dreadful Oaths, that unless thou secure them by a solemn *Oath*, they will kill thee; tell me, *W. P.* wouldst thou in this case rather lose thy life than *Swear*, to which by blasphemous threats they urge thee? I verily believe, that, as thou hast a plentiful Estate, thou wouldst not easily part with it, and thy life at once, by fondly bogling at an innocent Oath: This perswasion I have of thee, because, as thou professest thy self, with the rest of thy Gang, to be *men of Truth*, and transcendent Sanctity, so I conceive that thou hast not wholly forfeited thy Reason, but by that sparkling Light which still remains in it, thou (being cast into these streights) wil'st consider, *First*, that if thou refusest to *Swear*, thou shalt run upon the rock of a dangerous guilt, which is the breach of the Sixth Commandment,

mandment, by which the use of all lawful means for the preservation of our lives is commanded; and if we may preserve them and will not by such means, we are self-murderers. Now *Swearing* is not absolutely forbid neither by Christ nor his Apostles. *Secondly*, Thou surely wouldst consider, that by thy refusing to Swear, thou shouldst be the occasion, or rather the partial cause of the loss of thy Brother's Soul (a Thief by the bond of Nature is thy Brother) he being made guilty of Murther by shedding thy blood, which might be kept in thy veins by thy taking of that harmless *Oath*, the which being once taken, must be religiously kept, for that he that is robbed is bound to be silent, and not to betray a Thief, having Sworn not to do it; so the late most Pious and Learned Bishop of *Norwich* determines the Case, and annexes this saying to his determination, (to deterre all men from *Perjury*, or breaking their Oaths) *When once we have interessed God in any business, it is dangerous not to be punctual in the performance.* With him concurres in the same opinion the profound Doctor *Sanderson* in his Fifth Lecture and Seventeenth Section, where he disputes the case against *Baldwin*, once Professor of Divinity at *Wittenberg*, and having answered his three Arguments alledged to the contrary, concludes, That as it is not unlawful for one to Swear to a Thief, (supposing that if he did not, he should certainly be murder'd) so there lies a necessity upon him of keeping that *Oath* not to discover him to the Magistrate, *Si licuit jurare, licebit & juramentum observare*, they are his very words, *pag.* 132. So are not those cited out of his 141. *page* by the falsifying Penner of the *Treatise*; I must therefore be bold to tell that pen-

Cas. Conse. Resol. Dec. 1. c. 8.

Lib. de juram. obligat.

cerited

cited man of Truth that he is guilty of *Forgery*; I might rather say in plainer and more expres terms, of *Lye*, to which the Thirteen Abettors of the Treatise have subscribed, as they have to many more comprehended in that Treatise, (as shall hereafter be evidenced) The Author (or rather Authors of it, for no doubt many hands and Jesuited cunning Heads contributed to the composing of it) having asserted *every Oath to be vain and unlawful*, (under which notion the Oath of *Supremacy* and *Allegiance* must needs fall) in this opinion) gives this reason of his Assertion, *For Christ's Prohibition, Swear not at all, was not a meer Repetition of what was forbidden under the Law, but what the Law allowed*, as *Bishop* Sanderson *well observeth, in these words, It was not needful that Christ should forbid what was forbidden in it self, or was alwayes unlawful, which all Swearing was and is by the Third Commandment, Thou shalt not take, &c. Therefore Christ excepted the Prohibition of the Law*, i. e. *condemned all kind of Swearing*. This fallacious way of arguing, by making Authors speak what they never said nor intended, and by drawing conclusions from premises misinterpreted, has a great smack and rang of the *Jesuite*. But to the whole I answer thus *partim*, in particular; first I deny the truth of the Assertion, *Every Oath, &c.* and the Reason he gives for it I affirm to be invalid and false, *For Christ's Prohibition, &c.* In opposition to the Reason, First, I shall lay down this Thesis or Position, That Christ by his Precept or prohibitive Command repeated (and that he usually did) what was forbid by the Law, such is *vain Swearing*, and *Swearing* by any thing but by the Name of God in weighty causes, and in cases of *Necessity* when we-

Pag. 20.

There is not one Syllable to this purpose in that Page 141. of the Book Printed 1647.

we are commanded by the Authority of the Magistrate. Secondly, I affirm that it was needful and very expedient Christ should do it (as it was for Saint *Paul to write the same things to the Philippians*, chap. 3. 1.) and that, *First*, by reason of the perverseness, dulness, stupidity, and forgetfulness of mans nature, which needs *Line upon Line, Precept upon Precept*, that is, to have the same Commands and Prohibitions oft repeated, and inculcated. *Secondly*, it was needful and very convenient, that thereby he might shew that there was an amicable harmony or agreement between the *Gospel* and the *Law*, so that what was enjoyned and commanded by the former, is not forbid and condemned by the later. *Thirdly*, it was needful that so he might gain an higher estimate to the *Law of Moses*, by not contradicting or gainsaying of its Precepts, but ratifying the same by his Commands, he being greater than *Moses*, who received those lively Oracles from his mouth on the Mount. And, *Fourthly*, he might do it (*i.e.* repeat the same Commands which were delivered by *Moses*) to refute and give a check to those blasphemous conceits (which he foresaw would spring up in the Church in after Ages) or to those gross opinions of the *Manichees* and of their followers, who maintained that there were two Deities, the one Author of the *Old Law*, the other of the *New*, which are at large confuted by the *Malleus Hereticorum*, Saint *Austin* in his Tractates against *Faustus* the Manichean, and his Abettors, *Adimantus*, *Fortunatus*, *Secundinus*, and others.

Isa. 28. 13.

Tom. 6.

From all that has been said, and for these four Reasons I inferre, that the forenamed Author is guilty of no less a sin than *Blasphemy* by asserting, *That Christ*

Pag. 20.

forbade

forbade what the Law allowed, and in the room of such Oaths and Vows as were to be performed unto the Lord, he introduced Yea and Nay with a most absolute Swear not at all. What is this but to make our Blessed Saviour (who spake by the Prophets) to contradict himself, by commanding one thing in the Law, and another thing in the Gospel, or by forbidding what he had commanded; as if he (who is unchangeable, and whose *Precepts* as well as his *Promises* are *Yea and Amen*, i. e. immutable) had upon better thoughts altered his mind or judgement? To think this, much more to say it, is blasphemous. The Author of the *Treatise* does in effect say as much, by affirming that all Oaths, in their full compass and latitude, are by Christ's *Swear not at all* prohibited: witness his bold Protestation, which he makes in his own, and in the name of all his Brethren, *We profess our selves in the Fear of Almighty God, to be such, as have thus learned Jesus Christ, and for the Reverence we bear to his righteous Commandment, we can't take an Oath in any Case.* He should have said, we will not take God's Name in vain; for this in part is the sense and meaning of Christ's command, *Swear not at all.*

1 Cor. 1. 20.

Pag. 155.

If the *Treatist* (with his Confederates) bears such a Reverence to God's Commandments, why then does he (or how dares he) so audaciously and openly transgress against Three of them at once? I mean the Fifth, Sixth, and the Ninth, *Honour thy Father, &c. Thou shalt do no Murder. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy Neighbour.* This he has done by wounding the reputation of a most righteous and Learned Prelate the late Lord Bishop of *Lincoln*, a renown'd Father of the Church, now a glorious Saint in Heaven;